

THE *W*hole of the following will

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1859.

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELLER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

VIII. MY WANDERINGS AMONG THE MANIOTES IN SOUTHERN PELOPONNESSUS.

Description of Southern Laconia—Bardunian Filibusters—Levetzova—Battle of Trinasa—Marathonisi—Mairovouni—Capture of Bavarian Troops—Zanet-Bey—Colonel Feder—Castle of Passavd—Charming Scenery—Kakovouli and its Robbers—Langadi—Dangerous Defile—Tsimova—Manners and dress of the Maniates—Kutrakos the Pirate—Antiquities—Vitilos—Battle of Condura—Messenian plain—Historical recollections—Charles O. Müller—Temple of Diana Limniatis—Border Stones—Ithome—Messene and its ruins—Fall and restoration of ancient Messenia.

In several earlier numbers of our Review,* I have attempted to give some account of modern Sparta, its fate during the Sclavic invasions of the middle ages and the amalgamation of those barbarians with the native Greek population. I then described the conquests and feudal settlements of the French Crusaders, their victories and defeats in the fourteenth century, the re-establishment of the Byzantine Emperors at Sparta and their final overthrow by the Turks.

Instead of continuing with the melancholy and dull

* See the three articles on "Sparta and the Dorians" in Mercersburg Quarterly Review for 1856 and 1857.

picture of Turkish despotism in Greece, occasionally interrupted by bloody but fruitless wars against the Venetian Republic and always terminating in a still more degrading subjection of the Moreote Greeks beneath the scourge of their Othoman tyrants.* I shall here invite the reader to accompany me on a wandering through the rugged mountains of Maina, and after a flying visit among the poor but hospitable Maniotes, bring him safely down on the charming plains of Messenia, where, as Eurypides says, "All is beauty and fertility; where herds and flocks are grazing in the fields, watered by numerous rivulets; where the fiery beams of Apollo are softened by the invigorating breeze of the West and the snowy crests of Taygetus only enhance the beauty of the Paradise at their feet."

Here too I shall complete my picture of the old Dorian World by the striking contrast between Spartans and Messenians and the gallant resistance of the latter, their overthrow and restoration of their descendants, after a memorable exile of three centuries!

It was in August, 1843, while the Greeks in Athens were plotting against the government of King Otho, that I visited Sparta for the second time and spent my vacation among the Maniotes. A month later, the revolt at Athens on the night of the 15th of September, overthrew the Bavarian ministers, dismissed the foreigners and established a national assembly and constitutional government. I too, from a professor of the Military College of the Euelpides, had become a pilgrim, starting off for Jerusalem! Yet, during my excursion to the Peloponnesus, I had not the remotest presentiment of the events that were brooding. In company with Chevalier Schaubert, chief architect and secretary of the ministry of the Interior, I had passed a pleasant week at New-Sparta, where the governor, Signor

* Since the above was written, a work on this subject has been published in England: "The History of Greece under Othoman and Venetian dominion, by George Finlay, LL. D. Blackwood, London. 1856." It is rather a tedious book; to have made it interesting, it would have been necessary to consult Venetian manuscripts and official documents from that period. In Rauher's *Historisches Taschenbuch* is an essay "on the Venetian dominion in the Morea," which is praised. I have never been able to get it.

Latris, offered us every facility for the prosecution of our researches and excursions in the less explored regions of Mount Taygetus.

In Sparta we ought to have sent back our horses from Argos and hired Laconian mules, as better able to pass the dangerous mountain-paths of Mani. But on a former visit to Laconia, I had succeeded, though with some difficulty, in conducting my Argolian horse along the precipices of Taygetus ; we, therefore, disregarded the advice of the Spartans and retained our animals—but were soon punished by the continual danger and fatigue, to which we exposed ourselves afterwards, being obliged not only to walk the entire distance, but even to take the utmost care of the poor animals, which became exhausted and nearly broken down before we reached the plain of Messenia.

Having visited Amyclæ and sketched the ancient Doric Bridge at Pharis, which I described in my second article, we crossed the wood-clad ridge of Bardounia, from the summit of which the entire Laconian gulf is seen extending between the two parallel chains of Malevó and Taygetus, which terminate southward in the promontories of Malea and Tainaron.

This beautiful region of Laconia was formerly inhabited by a savage clan of Albanians, who, during the Russian invasion in 1770, had expelled the Greek inhabitants and appropriated to themselves the best part of the rich lands on the lower Eurotas, where their haughty Beys and Agás, like the feudal Barons of yore, maintained themselves in their strong holds, making a formidable body of several thousand horsemen. The Turkish government at Mistrás being unable to subdue them, connived at their depredations, and used them as a check upon the independent Greeks of Taygetus. But the hour of retribution was at hand ! On the out-break of the Revolution in the spring of 1821, ten thousand Maniates, commanded by Petróm Bey and Colocotronis, descended upon the plain, slaughtered the Turks and burnt Mistrás. The Bardouniote Albanians were obliged to abandon their territory, and fight

their way through their deadly enemies. They advanced in a long compact column, all well mounted. The women and children, with the baggage, were placed in the centre, while the Albanian horsemen covered the flanks with their terrible scimitars. Thus, fighting for life and death, they at last succeeded, with the loss of their baggage, in cutting through the crowds of Maniotes and escaping to Tripolezza on the Arcadian plain. But there they nearly all perished during the siege and not one of these savages ever saw his Albanian hills again. The recollection of these fierce tyrants is ever fresh among the people and the ruins of their villages and frowning towers are still seen on the slopes of the mountains. Though fertile, this region is but thinly inhabited. We stopped at the large village, Levézova, which is situated on the southern descent of the ridge and presents the most magnificent view to the plain of Eurotas, the coast and distant port of Marathonisi. On the marshy level eastward of the Eurotas—called Helos—stood in antiquity the city whose inhabitants in their vain resistance to the Dorian Spartans were made the serfs or *Helots* of the victors. Levézova, so beautifully placed on the main road, between Sparta and the coast, seems to have been destined to a happier fate—but, the wild spirit of its former inmates still haunts the town to this day. Murders and bloodshed are daily occurrences, and the German engineer, employed here by the Greek government to lay out the new carriage road, walked about armed to his teeth and told us, that he more than once had witnessed the violent quarrels of the mountaineers. The only relics of antiquity in the village, is a beautiful bas-relief of Castor and Pollux, holding their horses; it still embellishes the fountain-head on the square beneath a cluster of magnificent plane-trees. From here the descent to the coast is easy and delightful, through forests of olives and oaks. On the shore stands the ruinous tower of Trinisa, where, in 1826, one of the most heroic deeds of the Maniotes was performed. One hundred and twenty Greeks, led on by the brave Antonianni, here defended themselves so bravely that they kept

the whole Egyptian army of Ibrahim Pashá at bay for several days,—and at last, when they had expended their ammunition, cut their way through to their companions on Taygetus. They then defeated the enemy a second time at Kanára, forced him to retreat to Messenia, and thus saved Maina. Heaps of human bones are still seen all around the tower of Trinisa, once the residence of the proud and cruel Zalumis. If the stout and hardy Spartan had a single spark of the industrious activity that inspires the American, he would cease his quarrels and robberies and, as if by enchantment, transform this beautiful wilderness, to the happy seat of commerce and industry, of wealth and civilization, and the ruinous tower of Trinisa, with its mouldering skeletons, would become the thriving emporium of all Laconia and the interior of Peloponnesus.

At sunset we arrived at Marathonisi—the ancient Gytheion—at the entrance of Maina, or more properly *Mani*, as the Greeks call the peninsula. The small town, though not advantageously situated, is rapidly growing; some ships were lying at anchors, and now and then a steamer from Athens or the Ionian islands visits the Laconian gulf. Its port is formed by a small, flat island, Marathonisi or Fennel island, the ancient Cranæ; lying at a distance of only one hundred yards from the shore. It contains some store-houses and a Greek chapel, built on the foundations of a temple of Venus, to which Paris, the Trojan Prince, led Helena on their flight to Troy.

The ancient city of Gytheion was the port and naval station of Sparta. It became celebrated by its manufactures of purple cloth, the brilliant color of which was supplied by the purple-shell, gathered on the coast. The city lay north of the present Marathonisi, in a more fertile and pleasant position, occupying a large valley open to the sea, but hemmed in on the West by steep hills, so well fortified that the Gytheians repelled the attacks of Epaminondas and his victorious Theban army. The galley-port was artificial, being excavated in the rocky coast; immense moles or dikes are still seen extending under water for a

considerable length into the sea. Near a copious spring on shore, are brick ruins, baths from Roman times, and on a neighboring hill, from which I had a glorious view to the high waving oak-forests on the upper regions of Taygetus, is seen the cavea or hollow semi-circle of a large theatre and many foundations, partly hidden among the exuberant vines, corn-stalks, and creepers, which cover the entire soil of the ancient town. Several inscriptions are walled up in the churches of Marathonisi ; they refer to decrees of the confederation of the Eleuthero-Laonians (or Free Laconians) from the times of Augustus.

The woods, covering the mountain above the town, consist of the velanidi-oak, the acorns and bark of which are exported and used for tanning. The Velanidi is one of the best resources of Maina ; in fertile years more than three millions of pounds are sent to London, Marseilles and Leghorn. Captain Petrakis, a rich merchant at Tsimova, told me, that he yearly exported to London alone, Velanidi worth \$40,000. Another precious product of Maina is the scarlet-dye,—the prino-kokki—gathered from a vermillion excrescence of the holly oak, which yields several thousand pounds. Oil, too, is as abundant as excellent, and the towns on the western coast export twelve thousand barrels in good years. As the Turks never carried their arms and destruction into the Peninsula of Maina, the olive groves are at present more flourishing there than those on the Messenian plain, where those useful trees suffered so tremendous a havoc by the axe of the Egyptians, and the young scions, lately planted, have scarcely yet begun to give any harvest.

Hospitality is one of the most prominent virtues of the Maniotes, and every where, even in the poorest villages, the inhabitants vied with one another to offer us the *konaki* or night quarters in their cottages. Here in Marathonisi, we had been the guests of Anastasios Eliades, who told us that no letters of recommendation were necessary on the mountain. Next morning at sun-rise we pursued our journey on a rugged path, running high along the sea-shore

and affording the most splendid views to the gulf, the plain of Helos and the high eastern ridge of Malevō, terminating at Cape Malēa and the distant picturesque islands of Elafonisi and Cythera, (Cerigo) one of the seven Ionian islands belonging to Great Britain.

We had heard so much about the barrenness of this southern part of Laconia and of the wretchedness of its inhabitants, that we were pleasantly surprised to find the valleys so well cultivated and the slopes of the mountains covered with forests of velanidi-oak, caruba, chesnut and magnificent pines. The villages, like eagle nests, lie perched on the most inaccessible cliffs, and are every where fortified with towers. As peace now has been restored throughout the mountains, these monuments of a barbarous age have been either dismantled or serve as the residence of the chieftains, to whom king Otho has entrusted the military command in the peninsula. The farther we penetrated into the interior the more beautiful became the scenery; here and there the view opened on the Laconian gulf, with the towering promontory of Malesa in the blue distance.

Four miles south of Gytheion, lies the large village of Maurovouni or Black mountain, the ancient Larysion, which, in the recent history of Greece, has become well known as the disastrous battle-field of the Bavarians, who in 1834 here attempted, with some battalions of German infantry, to attack the Maniotes and force them to disarm their towers. The cunning highlanders permitted their inexperienced enemies to advance among the rocks in front of Maurovouni, and placing their red skull caps on the gray stones, they thus induced the Bavarians to blaze away and exhaust their shot; when all at once a column of four hundred stout Maniote riflemen lined the precipices in front, while a still larger body, leaping down the rocks like goats, cut off the retreat and thus forced several companies of Bavarians to lay down their arms and surrender as prisoners of war. They were of course stripped of arms and accoutrements and afterwards sent back to Marathoni-

si. Nine years later, in 1843, I still saw the sky-blue Bavarian uniforms worn by the poor women in Kakovouli!

The first sight of a Maniote village is extraordinary, because it consists of a number of high square towers with battlements and small round watch-towers, or *pepper-boxes*, at the corners. Some of these were formerly armed with long falconets, or swivel-guns, while the walls of the tower are loop-holed in every direction. They are generally four or five stories high, without any entrance or gate at the bottom. A high walled up stair-case is built at a distance of eighteen or twenty feet from the tower. It is fortified on the upper landing place and a draw-bridge of loose planks thrown across from a low window of the tower, forms the only communication of the warlike inmates with the world outside.

On the highest part of Maurovouni, commanding a view over sea and land of unrivalled beauty, stands the now ruinous castle of Zanét-Bey, the generous and hospitable Prince of Maina, in the early time of the French revolution—between 1780—1795—whose memory is still living in the midst of the people. A curious modern Greek poem in the common Maniote dialect, and containing a description of the country some sixty years ago, gives a most vivid picture of the manners at that time. “Zanét-Bey,” says the Poet, “is our hero and father, the firm column of his country who has done more for its welfare than ever another chief did before him. Nay, at the hour of dinner the great bell in his castle invites all the people around freely to partake of his board—and thus friends and foes sit side by side beneath the protecting roof of Zanét-Bey.”

Καμπάνα στο παλαιό του σήμανει βραδύ γεωργά.

Την είδα μίς τα ματιάμου, αυτό δεν είναι φύρμα!

Και οσοι την ακούσουνται διαρρέει περγανούν

Και τρωγούν εἰς τὴν ταβλαν τοῦ και χορνασμένοι βγανούν.

His principal enemy was the proud and avaricious Komunderákis of Kitriés, in western Maina, who, with the assistance of the Turks, attacked the Bey, but was defeated in several skirmishes. Among my cadets in the Military

College were three brothers of the family Komunderakis, young Maniotes, who always became furious when the defeat of their grand-father was mentioned.

At that time, at the beginning of the present century, the whole region was bristling with towers, and continued the scene of never ending bloody feuds until within ten years, when the government of King Otho succeeded in pacifying every part of the country. The clever Bavarian officer, who by his noble bearing and just and conciliatory measures gained the love and esteem of the mountaineers and their wrangling chieftains—was Colonel Feder, an excellent friend of mine, who himself on his return to Munich, has published an interesting work on his government in Maina. Calling the chieftains together he persuaded them for ever to renounce the hereditary revenge for blood, which for many centuries had stained the rocks of Maina with the blood of its leading families, and even with that of its priests and poor clans-men. These chiefs, by different concessions and decorations thus ably won for the King, were now the first to break down their battlements, disarm their towers, whose lower stories are now more comfortably furnished and have become of an easier access by a wooden stair-case running up along the dwelling on the outside. Colonel Feder thus disarmed all Maina in 1839-40; only a few castles in the most important positions were left entire and garrisoned by royal gendarmes. Five thousand brave soldiers were gained by Otho; the young men enlisted in several light battalions, who wore their national dress as a uniform, while their chiefs were promoted to places at court or lucrative employments in the islands. Maina has so much changed as to become the most settled and quiet province in the kingdom on my visit in 1843.

While speaking of this astonishing reform in the manners of this fierce race, I cannot omit to mention a curious fact with regard to the national pride of the chiefs. Colonel Feder, being a remarkably handsome man and enjoying the highest influence among them, resolved to settle in the country of his predilection, and one day sitting at dinner,

and in familiar conversation with the old Mavro Michalis, the so-called Prince of Maina, he said : " Compare-mou—my god-father or brother—I love thy pretty daughter Helen, give me her hand and I will be yours forever." The old chief, with eyes flashing with anger, answered scornfully, while pointing to his pistols hanging on the wall : " Rather than marry my daughter to a Bavarian, I would shoot her down with my Turkish pistols." Colonel Feder felt so mortified and unhappy at this scene, no doubt tenderly loving the beautiful young Maniote lady, that he immediately resigned his important command and returned to Germany. On the day of his departure from Tsimova a numerous procession of Maniote chieftains and warriors presented him with a magnificent suit of arms, sabre, dagger, pistols, gun, and cartridge-box, with their furniture, all gilt and inlaid with precious stones, the proudest trophy of Maina, in their victorious wars against the Turkish Pashás; thus giving that worthy officer a distinguished token of their regard and gratitude.

The most interesting object seen from the heights of Maurovouni, is the still larger feudal castle of Passavá, built during the reign of the Ville-Hardouins, by the French Baron Jacques de Neuilly, for the defence of the fertile and highly cultivated plain of Passavá. The French château presents a noble front with its high embattled walls and round flanking towers. Within its enclosure we found gardens with orange and lemon trees and some modern dwellings, built on ancient Greek substructures. Nay a large part of the outward wall is evidently of Hellenic construction, forming masses of free-stone marble blocks, which together with some other antiquities lately found, prove it to be the city of Las or Laas (the Stone), so accurately described by Pausanias. This place is the real paradise of Maina. The deep and clear river Passavá, descending from the upper regions of Taygetus, meanders through the rich vineyards and orange and olive plantations that cover its banks, while villages and isolated towers looking out from above the trees, add a new charm

to this grand and pleasing scenery. The sky was cloudless and of the deepest blue ; a light breeze from the sea refreshed the air, which was only burning and oppressive in the deep dells, through which we now passed on our approach to the main ridge of Taygetus—here called Sanghia ! The sea had disappeared and we found ourselves surrounded by immense, almost perpendicular walls of lofty crags. Quite overpowered with thirst and fatigue, we slowly moved on to a spring gushing out from the rocks in the shade of some gigantic plane trees. Around the fountain of the Papà or Priest, as it was called, we found a party of Maniotes reposing beneath the trees; some of them rose and stepping forward wished us welcome to “*Kakovouli, or the Land of Evil Council,*” so called from the roving habits of its inhabitants. Our Maniote friends were well dressed but unarmed ; they offered us their *Zizas* or gourds, with an excellent wine, while they with great appetite tasted some of our Bologna sausage. I was particularly struck with the physiognomy of these Kakovuliotes ; they are tall, well made, hardy and of a warlike deportment—yet different from that of the Albanians ; their faces are regular and expressive without being handsome, like the Hydriotes. Their eye is not black—like that of the other Greeks, but gray, and their looks as piercing as if their eye balls were darting from their sockets. It appeared, as if in a minute or two, they had already reviewed and estimated all our baggage and calculated the loss, which they now sustained by having become the peaceful subjects of king Otho !

A friend of mine, a Danish traveller, Chevalier Bröndsted, who, some forty years ago, traversed these mountains, was here stopped by a band of these Kakovuliotes. “Down from your horse ! Down on your face,” was the stern command from an invisible enemy, who, from behind the rocks and shrubbery, announced their presence only by the muzzles of their long fire-locks—the terrible Albanian *toufek*—pointed at the breast of the Chevalier. In a few minutes, baggage, money, clothing, even books and

papers, were in the hands of the robbers. Being thus left, in his deepest undress, the traveller called out to the handsome young captain, who commanded the Maniotes, "Capitano! permit me to keep my precious mosquito net—and take the rest with the Devil's passport." Laughing, the Greek answered: "By no means, Milordo! the mosquitoes sting me too!"—and in another moment the whole gang had disappeared among the precipices around.

These roving dispositions we already find mentioned in the Byzantine historians, as characteristic of the Maniotes, and they, no doubt, may be traced back to the ancient Spartans.

The celebrated British traveller, Sir George Wheeler, tells us that when, in 1674, he was stopping at a cottage of an old woman in Maina, his hostess fell bitterly a weeping, Sir George, supposing the cause of her sorrow to be that she had nothing to offer him, began to comfort her, but she quickly answered: "That her weeping was because her sons were not at home to rob him of his baggage!" I need not add, that Sir George instantly mounted and scampered down the defile as fast as his donkey could carry him.

Yet, as I said, there is no part of the Peloponnesus where the beneficial effects of the present royal government are so visible as here in Maina. The Maniotes took an active part in the Russian invasion of 1770, in consequence of which the Turks introduced the rule of the Beys, who commenced in 1772 with John Kutufari, and terminated in 1837 with Petróm-Bey, the sixth Prince of Maina. The Peninsula was during that period divided into ten captaincies, or capitanata, which now exist no longer; Petróm-Bey afterwards resided at his house in Athens with a seat in the Council of State and a salary of twelve hundred dollars. Since his death in 1843, the title of Prince of Maina has been abolished. The Highlanders are fond of arms and excitement; the greater part of the young men, therefore, serve in the army; many of the poorer go as porters and workmen to Athens, from whence they return during

the Easter festival ; the rest have now turned their attention to the cultivation of the arts of peace and civilization. Nay, such a change has come over the spirit of the Maniotes that the traveller of the present day can visit the wildest regions of the country without any fear of being robbed.

Beyond the Priest's fountain we entered the defile—*Langddi*—which crosses the Peninsula from east to west, dividing the high chain of Taygetus into two parts—the northern, called *Makrynon*, terminating precipitously at this pass—and the southern, rising steeply on the opposite side and sinking down on the promontory of Tainaron. This is one of the most remarkable features in the scenery of Maina ;—instead of ascending to its snowy peaks, and then crossing over again to descend on the Messenian Bay, we continued our fatiguing march through the defile for three hours, in the very heart of the mountains. Nature had already changed its appearance, the most barren, dreary wilderness surrounds the wanderer. At a great elevation some straggling villages are yet visible,—but soon every indication of vegetation,—the last olive tree—the last fence of cultivated terraces—cease ! The hue and color of the rocks, forming immense pyramids on all sides—are gray, mingled with dazzling white and black, which made them appear to me at a distance, as if they were composed of polished iron, and I almost fancied myself pent up within the steel-girt walls of some giant's castle. All objects around looked petrified ! At last we began to ascend the stony mountain on the west ; our poor horses were faltering and stumbling at every step among the huge blocks over which we led them with the greatest difficulty. The sun was just sinking behind the green Messenian hills, when on the top, the beautiful gulf of Corone spread out at our feet below. On the north, the deep bay and city of Vitolos ;—on the south, perched on a rocky offset of the highest ridge,—the capital of Maina, Tsimova, with its towers, cottages and scanty olive plantations. When we crossed a still higher ridge we likewise discovered the Laconic gulf on the east, and thus the greater part of the

peninsula, with both seas spread out like a map before our delighted eyes. The direct distance between the two gulfs in a straight line is only twenty-four miles—yet the awful state of the roads and the precipitous character of the mountains, interpose far greater obstacles in the communication from one village to another, than those which in Europe and America separate entire nations! On the other hand, these steel-colored bulwarks of nature are dear to the Maniote, for they preserved him alike from the Priestly encroachments of Constantinople and the bloody scimitar of the Turk. *Tsimova*, (a Slavonic word, signifying a winter residence,) now called *Areopolis*, or city of Mars, is the largest town in Maina. It is almost as inaccessible by sea as by land, lying more than two thousand feet above the level of the Mediterranean, on a precipitous coast, where the narrow pathway from the harbor Limani below, runs in many windings, zig zag, along the steep, jagged crags, that at every turning of the road seem to loosen themselves from their precarious position and threaten to bury the panting and terrified traveller and his mules beneath their enormous masses. From the summit the view is astonishing indeed, extending over the immense expanse of the Messenian gulf, with the long sweep of projecting capes, rocky islands and the distant plain of Messenia. What particularly increases the quite phantastic effect of this wild scenery, is the tremendous chasm and deep inlet of the sea on the north side and the appearance of a large city, Vivilos, the ancient Oitylos—on the opposite side. Though the distance between the two cities from the heights, seems only that of a mile, yet, some days afterward, it took us more than five hours fatiguing walk to descend to the port of Limani and ascending again the rocks on the north side of the chasm to reach the ancient ruins of Oitylos. Such is the optic deception in the rugged mountains and the transparent atmosphere of the Mediterranean. Southward the view stretches along the wild and dreary coast for thirty miles to the prominent cape Thyrides, by the mariner at present called Cavo-Grosso.

The towers and houses of Taimova lie dispersed about on the rocks half a mile from the precipice. In the square a number of Kakovulotes were assembled, and the rich Basílios Kutrákos immediately offered us the *Konaki* in his tower. Our landlord was an active man, of the middle size, having the intelligent eye and easy address, which generally characterize the Greek, but are still more prominent among the free born highlanders of Maina. His dress, though elegant and picturesque, differed from that of the other Moreotes of the plain, who have adopted the white Albanian kilt, called *fustanella*. The Maniates, on the contrary, like the Hydriotes and other Islanders, wear the round, laced jacket, red scarf and the large trowsers, falling in deep folds beneath the knee, where they are tied together. In the scarf or belt, they have now no longer stuck the dirk and the long horse-pistols—and a small silver sheathed knife has taken the place of the terrible *yatagan*! Signor Kutrákos had during the late war been a daring pirate, with his armed and well-manned mistic making sad havoc among the Austrian merchant vessels. Immediately on our arrival a curious scene occurred which admirably depicts Grecian character and manners. My own servant in the Peiraeus, being sick at my departure for Morea, I had, on recommendation, taken into my service a workman from the harbor by the name of Georgi, who proved himself an excellent cook and a clever servant. When Georgi now entered the tower with our baggage, Signor Kutrákos looked sharply at him and said, with an air of astonishment: "Me thinks, I have seen thee before, brother, is not thy name Georgi?" Georgi made an inclination of the head in acquiescence and skulked away. Kutrákos then turned toward us and said, with a smile: "I instantly knew Georgi again. I met him at Syra many years ago, during the war, when I wanted to smuggle some silk stuffs into the town. Georgi was then a custom officer; he demanded four dollars for himself and his companion, and promised to let me pass. Taking a large bundle under my arm I landed in the evening and enter-

ed the city, but was soon stopped by other custom officers, who ordered me to follow them to the office. While thus walking through the dark and narrow streets of Syra, I remarked an open store, into which I hurled my bundle, unperceived, and on my arrival at the Custom-house, I pretended to know nothing about the bundle, was acquitted and returned on board. I had never before been in Syra, and, therefore, in vain ran up and down the streets to find the house in which I had deposited my goods. But one day a woman, standing in the door of a store, said: *Afendi!* what do you search for? I entered, told her my adventure and she then produced my packet with my French silks. I took out the prettiest silk-gown, made her a present of it, and hurried away, glad that I had eluded the treachery of Georgi."

Afterwards, on our questioning Georgi about his double-dealing, he excused himself by saying, that he had not received a cent of his pay for months; that his poor mother was sick and dying,—that he saved her with the money he thus obtained from the PIRATE, who, by accident, fell into the hands of other officers, having come on shore too late in the evening, after his own release from guard.

Here we have the shrewdness, and yet simplicity, the treachery, and yet honesty, of the Greeks, so curiously mingled together, which being told with liveliness and wit in their own imimitable language, sometimes make us connive at their easy morals and smile at their ingenious tricks!

Our hostess, Signora Kutrakos, was as beautiful as her husband, the pirate, was intelligent and polite. She told us traits of character of her countrywomen, which showed that the present Maniote women still have the fortitude and virtue of the ancient Spartans. It is a fact that all the women of Maina not many years ago were trained to arms; and a great number of them fought at the side of their husbands. In 1826 Ibrahim-Pasha resolved from Messenia to attack and subdue the Maniotes, who immediately with all their forces hurried to the défilés at Verga, on the Messenian Gulf, where in a brilliant and hard fought

battle defeated the Egyptians. During the action, another division of Arab troops had embarked on board the fleet and making a sudden attack on Limani, the port of Tsimova, had contrived to ascend the rocky heights and threatened to occupy the town.

But the mother of Petróm-Bey, a lady sixty years of age, who had already reared a whole line of heroes, retired to the inaccessible crags of Kakovuli, assembled there all the remaining population, young and old, and pouncing upon the stupid Arabs, not only defeated them, but pursuing them closely down the terrible zig zag foot-path to the shore, forced numbers of them to precipitate themselves into the sea, and thus frustrated the designs of the cruel Ibrahim-Pasha—who never afterwards dared to disturb the mountaineers in their stronghold.

The western coast from Tsimova to the cape of Matapan, is called the *Kakovuli*, or Inner Mani, (Messa Mani), and is the most stony and inhospitable part of the Peninsula; here it is the Poet sings: “that while the men are scouring the sea in pursuit of piracy and robbery, the women at home sow and reap, collect the sheaves at the thrashing floor, winnow it with their hands and thresh it with their feet. At night they turn the hand-mill and grind the wheat, weeping and singing lamentations for the dead.”

In 1840 their scanty harvest of barley and beans failed altogether, and the Greek government of king Otho was obliged to send a number of vessels with provisions for their support, to which the inhabitants from other parts of the kingdom generously contributed.

The entire peninsula of Mani was inhabited in antiquity, and both Strabon and Pausanias have left us interesting descriptions of many cities, temples and sepulchral monuments situated all along its rugged coasts, the greater part of which we can still trace in their ruins or site at the present day. In the interior the Spartans had rich quarries of black marble, and their iron mines furnished them with that excellent metal, which rendered Spartan arms and armor celebrated throughout the ancient world. Yet the

only spot of any historical importance was the high precipitous promontory of Tainaron, now cape Matapan, seven miles in circumference, on the summit of which stood in a sacred grove the temple of Neptune near a cavern, which the Greeks supposed to have been one of the descents to Tartarus, whence Hercules was said to have dragged forth the hell-dog Cerberus. Not only the well preserved walls of the temple and the cavern, but numerous cisterns, votive tablets, and other excavations in the rocks around prove the peculiar veneration of the ancients for this sanctuary.

To the statue of the sea-god Neptune, fled the martyrs of liberty as well as the guilty criminals; the sacred precincts of the temple were the asylum of the persecuted and unhappy! Christian worship is at this day offered up on the altar, near which the austere Ephors of Sparta were concealed, when they caused their unsuspecting General Pansanias to betray his ambition and confess his treacherous alliance with Xerxes against the liberty of his native country. In later times, after the death of Alexander the Great, the promontory of Tainaron became the gathering place of the thousands of outlaws and adventurers, who sought a refuge from the tyranny of the Macedonian ruler of Greece. Here the princes of the East found large bodies of mercenary soldiers, whom they enlisted in their service. From here started, 323, the noble minded Leosthenes, with his thirty thousand Greek warriors, for the deliverance of his country, though his death at Lamia, and the subsequent victory of the Macedonian Antipater in Thessaly brought Greece under a heavier yoke than before.

The whole western coast, until a days journey north of Tsimova, a distance of fifty miles, forms a continual precipice of rugged cliffs, towering more than two thousand feet above the raging and boiling sea below, and presents the most striking contrast to the charming shores of Messenia, beyond the gulf on the west, with their olive and orange groves, interspersed with towns and villages.

Having spent a day with our Pirate-landlord and let our

poor horses recover somewhat from their fatigue, on the 10th of September we continued our route northward along the western cliffs toward Messenia. We visited the ruins of Vivilos and the temple of Serapis, and then descended to the coast along the vineyards and olive plantations of the fine villages of Thalamo, Pephnos, Cardamyle and Zarnata, which by the many French and Venetian castles, churches and convents, still in good preservation from the middle ages and by the general ease and gaiety of their industrious inhabitants prove, that the sword of the Turks never reached the secluded regions of this iron-bound coast. We stood on the Gerenian hill of old Nestor and looked down upon the fertile plains of Messenia. A long line of fortifications now in ruins, show the defile of Verga, where Ibrahim in 1826, was defeated by the Maniates and farther on in the plain below, the olive-grove of Kundura brought to our memory the victory of the French barons and the conquests of Robert of Champlite in the times of the Crusades, in 1207.

Here we take leave of Mani and enter Messenia, the most fertile and best cultivated region of Peloponnesus.

The land of dispute, which made Sparta covetous and unjust, is a large fertile plain, on the north and east undulating—on the south, toward the sea, a perfectly flat level. The river Pamisus, receiving numerous smaller rills, fertilizes the plain and discharges itself into the Messenian gulf. One of the highest mountains of Peloponnesus, Mount Lyceus, now called Dioforti, and the river Neda separate Messenia from Elis and Arcadia on the north. Mount Taygetus forms a still more formidable barrier east, toward Laconia; while along the western coast, a lower ridge, covered with beautiful forests, extends southward to the promontory of Akritas, now Cavo-Gallo. From the middle of the delightful plain, by the ancients termed Makaria or *Blessed*, rise the two precipitous and picturesque mountains, Evan and Ithome, both on the east united by a low and sharp ridge. Mount Ithome has in its form and strength a remarkable resemblance to the Acro-Korinth, on the

Isthmus, and it was considered as the second bulwark of Peloponnesus by Philip II. of Macedonia, who called these inaccessible fortresses the two horns of the Laconian bull, for he hoped, that when once possessing them, he could be able to master all the Peninsula.

On the eastern slope of Evan lies the monastery of Vurkano, where we were well received by the hospitable Kallayers, and enjoyed from the battlements of the chapel a superb and extensive view over the plain, the mountains and the sea. This is the place to recall some of the most striking events in the history of the Dorians. I have already given an account of the early conquest of Messenia by Cresphontes, the Herakleid chieftain, at the head of a Dorian army, about the year 1104, B. C. The quiet husbandmen of the plain were more easily overpowered than the warlike Achaeans of the Laconian highlands. In Messenia, too, we perceived the natural influence of climate and soil in the peaceful blending of both races—Dorian *warriors* and Lelegian *rustics*. How different was the fate of the Helots of Sparta? Cresphontes, and his son, Aepylos, though not without resistance from the haughty Dorian conquerors themselves, succeeded in this amalgamation; equal rights and privileges were awarded to foreigners and natives—and thus we only meet with peace, tranquility, commerce and industry on the happy plains of Messenia. While in Sparta sounds the trumpet of war, while there all is austerity and oppression, and even her virtues, negative abstemiousness and a stifling of the milder feelings of the human heart,—we listen to the sweet melodies of the shepherds' flute on the banks of the Pamisus; there something peaceful, pastoral, arcadian, pervades the character of the people; its history speaks of no conquests, we hear only of the joyous introduction of religious festivals, of benevolent gods, who are honored with rural sanctuaries and bloodless sacrifices, nay, even the names of their kings denote the shepherd and the minion of the gods; while in Sparta, the names of the Herakleid kings reminds us of prowess and glory and the thunders of war. I

could give many interesting proofs of this, but I must hurry on with my subject.

Sparta, not satisfied with the oppression of Laconia, yearned for the possession of the better lands of her inoffensive Doric brethren ! Her continued encroachments, and her cruelty, at last brought on those terrible, destructive wars which, after eighty years, from 743—663, of almost incredible exertions and sufferings on the part of the Messenians, terminated with the victory of Sparta and the slavery or exile of the vanquished. No event in ancient history is more tragical, more poetical, or excites more our sympathies, than the struggle between the Messenian and the Spartan !

Messenia had the fate of Poland ; she was subdued by the sword and treachery of the stronger tribe of her own nationality ; and therefore the more furious and inveterate the hatred ; because it was a civil war ! Sparta, like Russia, not only confiscated and divided her beautiful lands, disarmed and enslaved her sons, but even added insults and outrages to her cruelty.

But in the book of Fate stands written that brave and virtuous nations shall not perish by fraud or injustice. Messenia rose again from her ashes, and so will Poland—and the day may not be far off, though her horizon is still dark and cloudy. Had the Messenians been less heroic, less persevering, they would have melted away among the foreign tribes in Italy and Africa, where they found a refuge during an exile of three centuries. But quite on the contrary, the Messenians, like the Poles, did not mix with the less noble races, among whom they encamped for a time ; they remained Dorians in worship, language and habits, and when in the year 370, B. C., the shrill bugle of Epaminondas sounded a gathering of the Messenian clans far away over the seas, they obeyed, and that younger generation, who then returned as the still inveterate enemy of Sparta, joyfully rebuilt the ancient cities of Ithome and Messene, and soon gave the death-blow to their oppressor forever. Ithome and Messene, both fortress and

city—even to this day remain some of the proudest and most beautiful monuments of Hellas. Yet, before I attempt to describe them, I must here mention some important discoveries which lately have been made, and which serve to illustrate many events in Messenian history. It was this restoration of the Messenian people; it was their hatred and fear of Sparta, that resuscitated and multiplied the early traditions, the songs, and historical facts respecting the wars of the old Messenians. They were repeated by all the enemies of Sparta and thus widely spread throughout Hellas. Sparta had brave soldiers—but no historians; even her poets were foreigners. Alkman was a Lydian; and Tyrtaeus, the great bard of the Messenian wars, an Athenian. The original works from this period are lost; but part of their contents was preserved by Pausanias in his admirable description of Messenia. Yet, although he presents us with bright and lively pictures, which have a greater semblance of authenticity than many parts of the more recent history of Greece, nevertheless, modern historians, such as Charles O. Müller, and George Grote, have, in their own sceptical manner, attempted to throw doubts and disbelief on every part of Messenian history. Without the least regard to the important discoveries of latter years in Laconia and Messenia, they have begun to pull down the whole structure, and being more cruel and heartless than the Spartans themselves, they have, with a stroke of their pen, destroyed our sympathy for the tragical fate of Aristodemus and our admiration of the valor and patriotism of Aristomenes. If we would surrender the sanctuary of Grecian history to their hands, not one stone of it would be left on the other, and as Mommius, the Roman barbarian, burnt the temples of Corinth, so would our modern sceptics pervert, misrepresent and destroy the pure and simple words of the ancient historians. Thus the Messenian wars to them had become a fancy and a fiction, the dream of a Cretan poet!

But how great was the astonishment of Professor Charles Ottfried Müller, when on his arrival in Greece in 1840, he

himself found every where in Messenia the most interesting monuments still existing from those *remote* times of the early Messenian feuds in the seventh century, before Christ. On his return from the Peloponnesus he told me, that he had entirely changed his former opinion, but that he would not express himself on this subject before he had published the second edition of his work on the Dorians—which he did not live to accomplish—dying from fever a month later at Athens, on the 1st of August, 1840. His travelling notes published by Professor Adolph Schöll, contain many of these unexpected discoveries and the altered views of the great historian.

It is here the place to mention a few facts, which throw a new light on disputed points of Messenian history. Lacedaemon and Messenia possessed a joint temple on the borders, where sacrifices were celebrated in honor of Artemis or Diana Limnatis, an institution, dating from the remotest ages. During such a festival, celebrated by Spartan virgins, a body of Messenian youths broke into the sanctuary of the goddess and carried away the priestesses. The Spartan king, Teleklos, who hurried to the rescue, was slain and his followers defeated. Different versions were afterward given of this event, but the death of the Spartan king and the outrage in the temple of Diana, became the main cause or pretence of the Messenian war. For centuries the site and the existence of the temple was unknown, until the Eparch of Calamata, Kyrios Perikles Zographos, in 1836, discovered its ruins on a lofty hill on the western slope of Taygetus. These ruins consist of the substructions of the sanctuary, a number of octagonal columns and some precious inscriptions mentioning Chartos Euthykeos, the priest of Diana Limnatis. A Christian Chapel is now built on the spot by the peasants, called Vólimnos, or ‘ox-pool.’ Immediately above the temple, on the highest ridge of Taygetus, four thousand five hundred feet over the plain, are standing several marble boundary stones having the inscription: “*Border of Lacedaemon toward Messenia,*” which seem to have been erected by the Roman Emperor

in order to terminate the eternal disputes between the hostile neighbors.

Another discovery was made by Prof. Charles O. Müller himself. While investigating the upper plain, situated between Mount Lycaeum and Taygetus, here called Makry-Plagy, or "*the Long-Side*," where the Dorians settled after the conquest,—he found extensive ruins near the village Philia. The learned antiquary immediately undertook some excavations and ascertained that Philia, on the high road between Messene and Megalópolis, in Arcadia, was the celebrated *Andania*, the capital of the Dorian kings of the dynasty of the Aepytidæ—which was destroyed by the Spartans during the first Messenian war, and never rebuilt afterwards.

In different parts of Greece, old traditions still survive among the rustics and shepherds. Thus, for instance, the pastors on Mount Oeta will record the heroic death of Leonidas at Thermopylæ; the Albanian farmer on the plain of Marathon pretends still to hear, during night, the neighing of horses, the clashing of arms and the rush and shouts of contending armies. In Arcadia and Messenia, so long possessed by the French Barons, the native Greco-Slavonians, at their fire-side, still to this day, tell wonderful stories about the cavaliers, their tournaments—*κοντραρια κτυπηματα*—and adventures. Many mountain fortresses are called, Castle of the fair Lady—(*το καστρον της αραιας*)—and the villagers sing ballads about the bravery of the French Dame defending her possessions against the Turks, who at last succeeded, by treachery, in penetrating through the gates and killing the good Lady. It is principally the mountaineers of Taygetus, the old Klephts, who preserve their Spartan traditions. On the direct road from Mistras, westward, over the crest of the mountain, where I mentioned the old border-stones, down to Calamata in Messenia, lies a deep chasm or glen among terrific precipices, along which the path winds. I never saw a wilder scenery nor a more rugged road. My guide was dashing along in front, holding his gun with both his hands over his

neck and singing his robber songs, when he stopped short and pointing at a narrow opening in the rock opposite the valley, cried out to me : "Affendi, look there ! It was through this chasm that Aristomenes, the Messenian hero followed the fox, who thus taught him to escape from the pit into which the Spartans had thrown him and his comrades." Though mere tradition, the fact itself of a wild Pallikar knowing the adventures of his forefathers twenty-five hundred years ago, among the scenes of their sufferings and glory, was so extremely interesting and exciting to me, that it made me forget all the fatigue and danger with which I was then contending.

Here in the mountains the villages are populous and flourishing, but on the whole western coast of Messenia the destruction of buildings, vineyards and olive plantations by Ibrahim Pasha and his Arabs, was most awful. The beautiful towns of Coron, Modon and Navarino, so well known from the naval combat in 1827, in which Turkey lost her fleet and all hope of re-conquering Greece,—were still lying in ruins or slowly reviving. Our principal attention will, therefore, be directed to the city of Epaminondas, at the foot of Mount Ithome, of which this picture gives a very accurate representation. The old city, built around the great temple of Zeus Ithomatas, was situated on the broad and level summit of the mountain. Here the Messenians for ten years withstood all the efforts of the Spartans ; here Aristodemos, fired by ambition and superstition, sacrificed his beautiful daughter, and afterward, pursued by the furies of contrition and despair, stabbed himself on her tomb. The Spartans demolished the city, but many foundations of the temple and outer walls still exist. A Greek church crowns the summit ; and the immense cisterns near, contain excellent water. After the defeat of the Spartans in the battle of Leutra in 370, Epaminondas, at the head of seventy thousand Thebans and their Allies, invaded Laconia and proclaimed the restoration of Messenia. Thousands of unhappy Helots were set at liberty and armed. The descendants of the old Messenians

in Sicily, Lower Italy and Africa, and others who, in Hellas, had found a refuge among the enemies of Sparta, all returned in triumph to their native shores, where they were received by Epaminondas and his Theban army, who with the clangor of trumpets and the sacred pomp of processions and sacrifices proceeded to re-build here on the ridge of Mount Ithome their city, which for so long a time had lain desolate. Epaminondas, during a dream, had the vision of an ancient hero, who ordered him to build the new city on the ruins of the old metropolis. The responses of the Augurs, who were consulted, whether the new city would prosper, were favorable; the victims too were propitious—every thing bore the aspect of hope and joy. Artists and workmen from every part of Greece hurried to Messenia; building materials were brought in from all quarters; both Argos and Arcadia contributed their part, and thus within the short time of sixty days, the wonderfully strong and beautiful walls, running down along the slope of the mountain from Ithome, and with thirty-six towers and several gates, all well preserved to this day, uniting with the heights of Evan, and thus enclosing a space of eight miles,—were erected beneath the superintendance of Epaminondas. Nor did he return to Bœotia until he had sufficiently strengthened this new bulwark against the haughty despotism of Sparta. The interior of the city was laid out with great magnificence; several temples arose; streets were strewn with large flag pavements; the stadium, theatre, and many highly ornamented public buildings were erected—and a new Messene grew up on the site of the old; like a fabled city, charmed into life by the sound of the Orphean harp. But this was not enough; the poor exiles now constituted their government and army and uniting again as a nation, remembered their sacred duty: of union and harmony among themselves and of war against Sparta! Therefore on Mount Ithome they solemnly invoked the Divine powers and their glorious progenitors to come and dwell among them—they specially addressed their prayers to the heroes of ancient Messenia,

Eurytos, Cresphontes—and above all, with the unanimous voice of the whole nation, to Aristomenes, whose statues adorned the square and principal sanctuaries of the city.

I said that the walls, with their square or round towers and double gates, are in excellent preservation, and exhibit the finest specimens of military architecture in Greece;—nay, they make us, as it were, the cotemporaries of Epaminondas, under whose direction they were raised, by exhibiting to us a complete model of the systematic fortifications of that age. The walls are built in horizontal courses, with huge right angular stones. Almost all the towers are square built, in two stories, with windows and embrasures, splayed on the inside to admit more light and afford a freer range for the emission of the projectiles from within. Particularly beautiful is the large north-western gate, which led to Arcadia; it incloses a court sixty-three feet in diameter, in the wall of which is a niche for a statue, on each side of the gate. The outer gate between its huge flanking towers is in good preservation; but on the inner door the soffit, an immense stone twenty feet in length has fallen, so as to rest against the side of the door-way. The rich vegetation of shrubs and trees around, and the magnificent back-ground of Mount Ithome, with its deep clefts and bold precipices, altogether form one of the most picturesque views in that land of beauty and poetry.

At the time of the French expedition in the Morea, in 1828, Colonel Bory de Saint-Vincent undertook extensive excavations within the range of the walls, where a number of precious antiquities were found; nay, the greater part of the ancient city, below the fountain of Mauromati or Black-Eye—the ancient Klepsydra—were laid open; the stadium, theatre, several temples, baths, streets, numerous bas-reliefs and architectural ornaments were discovered—but so rich is the soil of happy Messenia, so exuberant the growth of her vegetation, that almost all these curiosities have vanished beneath the thick groves of myrtle, laurel, agnus-castus, lentesk, juniper, wild olive, and a hundred other odorous and beautiful shrubs, while the industrious

peasants of Mauromati, a pretty village, built in this paradise, around the copious spring of Mount Ithome, have cultivated every span of ground with Indian corn, wine and tobacco—in such a manner that the traveller at the present day must rest satisfied with the grand sweep of walls and towers, running up hills and down valleys, in an immense curve toward Mount Ithome—with the magnificent view from the summit far away on sea and land,—with the pleasing or exciting recollections of the joys and sorrows, the virtues and crimes of the ancient Dorians,—*Messenians* as well as *Spartans*, who here met in deadly strife. And at last, wearied in mind and body by all these impressions, he, like myself, will be glad to retire to the frugal supper and excellent wine of the hospitable monks of Vurkano !

Lancaster, Pa.

A. L. K.

ART. II.—NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL.

Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God.
By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. 1858.

A truly interesting work, as may be easily presumed at once from its authorship and title. No subject could well be more important, especially for the present time, than that which is here brought into view; and there are few men better fitted than Dr. Bushnell to discuss any theme of the sort in an earnest, vigorous, and manly way. We welcome the book, with all our heart, as a most valuable accession to the theological literature of the age, and trust that it may exert a large and wide influence in the service of truth. It is no hasty production, but the carefully studied and well digested treatment of a great question, which has been before the mind of the author for years, and

on which plainly he has bestowed the whole force of his ripest and best thoughts. The book, therefore, is one which requires study also on the part of the reader. It is not just of the *current* literature sort, formed for the easy entertainment of the passing hour. It grapples with what the writer holds to be the religious life question of the age; its course is everywhere, more or less, through inquiries which are felt to be both intricate and profound. And yet with all this, the work is never either heavy or dull. On the contrary, it may be said to overflow with genial life. Dr. Bushnell has contrived to throw into it the full vivacity and freshness of his own nature. It is rich throughout with thoughts that breathe, and words that glow and burn. A sort of poetical charm is made to suffuse the entire progress of its argument, relieving the severity of the discussion, and clothing it oftentimes with graphic interest and force. Altogether the book is one which deserves to live, and that may be expected to take its place, we think, among the enduring works of the age. It is of an order, in this view, with Hugh Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks*; and as an argument for the truth of the Christian religion, may compare favorably with Reinhard's *Plan of the Founder of Christianity*.

So much we may say, without pretending to endorse in full the course of thought presented in Dr. Bushnell's book. The worth and importance of such a work are not to be measured simply by what may be considered the validity of its opinions at particular points. We may find reason to question many of its propositions—we may feel ourselves constrained to pause doubtfully in the presence of much to which it challenges our assent—and yet be fairly and rightly bound, notwithstanding, to own and honor its superiority, as shown in the profound significance of its general thesis, the reigning scope of its discussion, the reach and grasp of its argument taken as a whole. The claim to such respectful homage, in the case before us, is one in regard to which there can be no dispute.

We agree fully with Dr. Bushnell, in believing the ten-

dency of the present time to be fearfully strong toward Rationalism—that form of infidelity, which seeks to destroy Christianity, not so much in the way of direct opposition to its claims, as by endeavoring to drag it down from its own proper supernatural sphere into the sphere of mere nature, making it thus to be nothing more in the end than a particular phase simply of natural religion itself. On both sides of the Atlantic, we find a large amount of intelligence enlisted openly in the defence of this view; seeking, with no small measure of learning and ingenuity, to resolve all the higher aspects of the Gospel into poetry and myth, and pretending to bring out the full sense of it at last in the experiences of a purely humanitarian culture. But it would be a most inadequate view of the case, to suppose the evil of such unbelief confined to any formal demonstrations of this sort. As a silent tendency—a power secretly at work to sap the foundations of faith and piety—the rationalistic spirit in question takes in a vastly wider range of action. Multitudes, as Dr. Bushnell observes, are involved in it virtually as a system of thought, without being themselves aware of the fact. They profess to honor Christianity as a divine revelation, take its language familiarly upon their lips, persuade themselves it may be that they continue strictly loyal to its heavenly authority; and yet all the time they are false in fact to its claims, casting it down from its proper excellency, and substituting for it in their minds another order of thought altogether. In this way, we are surrounded on all sides with a nominal Christianity, which is little better in truth than a sort of baptized Paganism, putting us off continually with heathenish ideas expressed in Christian terms.

Our public life is full of such essential infidelity. It reigns in our politics. It has infected our universal literature. The periodical press floods the land with it every week. It makes a merit generally indeed of being friendly to religion; but it is plain enough to see, that what it takes to be religion is something widely different from the old faith of the Gospel in its strictly supernatural form. It is,

when all is done, naturalism only, of the poorest kind, dressed up in evangelical modes of speech. That it should be able to pass current for any thing better—that the public at large, the so called Christian public, should show itself so widely willing to accept any such authority as having any sort of force in matters of religion—is only itself a most painful sign of that general weakening of faith, of which we are now speaking as the great moral malady of the times. Already too the disease has entered deep into our systems of education ; and there is but too much reason to fear, that its worst fruit on this ground is yet to come.

Our system of public schools is often spoken of, as being the strength of our institutions, the safeguard of our liberties, the crown of our civilization, the distinguishing glory of our truly enlightened age. But we hazard nothing in saying, that it proceeds from beginning to end, not on the believing recognition of the supernatural claims of Christianity, but on their virtual rejection and denial. It does not help the matter in the least, that it offers no formal contradiction to the idea of revealed religion ; the burden of the difficulty lies just here, that claiming, as Christianity does, to be a supreme authority for men's minds, it is notwithstanding prohibited by the system from the exercise of any such authority in what is allowed on all hands to be a fundamental interest of our life—that it is politely bowed to the one side, and made to stand out of the way, while another theory of religion altogether is practically introduced into its place. The case is too clear for any controversy. Education, to be Christian, must make earnest with the realities of a higher life in their own true and proper form, subordinating all merely natural and temporal ends to the claims of God and the eternal world, under such explicit and positive view. Under any other character, it must stand condemned at once, as being hostile in fact, and not friendly, to religion. Tried by this rule, our common school system, as it now prevails, loses all title to respect. It ignores positive Christianity, and pretends to educate the young without its help ; as though it were pos-

sible to fit them for the duties and trials of life, by holding their minds down to the things of the present world only, without any sort of reference to their highest destiny as it is comprehended in the "powers of the world to come."

All such education is in truth "God-less." It reflects honor on the Catholic Church, we think, that she condemns it, and requires her membership to keep clear of it, though it be at the heavy cost of forming and maintaining separate schools for their own use. For what better proof could she furnish, that for *her* at least the truths of religion, in the form in which she holds them, are indeed articles of faith, which as such carry with them supernatural authority, and are not to be set aside, or suspended in their force even for a moment, in favor of any other interest or opinion whatever? If other ecclesiastical communions show themselves more liberal here, and less jealous for the rights of what they hold to be the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God, it is hard to see certainly how it can redound much to the credit of their faith. It would seem to imply rather one or the other of these two things: either that they have no clear apprehension of any positive distinctions in the Christian scheme, or that all such distinctions are with them at last matters of opinion only rather than the power of a living creed. To speak of an extra-ecclesiastical training in the case, that may be allowed to provide for the interest of religion in a general way, handing over its subjects afterwards to the care of the different religious communions, to be completed by them severally in their own way, is only to expose the radical defect of the whole scheme. Every such view proceeds on an assumption, which is found to break down in the end all real distinction, between positive Christianity and the religion of mere nature clothed with its name. Neither is it enough, as some dream, to have the Bible regularly read in such schools; as though that somehow, in and of itself, were positive Christianity, and sufficient in this naked way to meet and satisfy in full the demands of a Christian education. They show a wonderfully poor conception of religion, who think to vindicate its supre-

macy, and to gain free field for its proper action, in any such easy manner as this. As the use of the Bible falls in readily, we can see everywhere, with the conflicting views of all religious parties and sects, so has it been abundantly shown in our time, that it may be made to suit itself just as readily also to the views and wishes of those who turn all revelation into a mere fable. Infidels and naturalists have shown themselves, in many cases, most zealous for the honor of the Bible in such abstract view, and none commonly are more apparently cordial in crying out for its untrammeled use in the public schools. They are perfectly content to have it thus dignified as a text book of morality, patriotism, and sentimental humanitarianism, if only it be to the exclusion of Christianity in its concrete supernatural form, and in the midst of associations that go always to sink the heavenly sense of it down to the level of their own miserable unbelief. It needs more a great deal than this, we repeat, to redeem our schools from the charge of being against Christ, because they are not with him, and for him, in any direct positive way.

The case indeed speaks for itself. If there be anything that may be said specially to distinguish our system of common schools, it would seem to be the intense worldliness of their spirit, as opposed to all practical belief in the existence of things unseen and eternal. They are the agency of the State, directed only toward secular and political ends. The spirit that breathes through their administration is predominantly earthly. Their educational apparatus looks everywhere only to the things of this world. All turns on knowledge—the knowing of things in a simply natural way, for the ends and uses of the present life; as though this, after all, were the “chief end of man,” and the highest good proposed to him this side the grave. No wonder, that in such circumstances the very atmosphere of the school room should come to be impregnated, as it were, with the poison of unbelief, and that the minds of the young, exposed to its daily influence, should grow up cold, hard, materialistic, impassive to heavenly impressions, and

ripe at last only for the deeds of the flesh. Is not this result showing itself plainly enough already, for any observing mind? And is there not every reason to fear, that it will come out more terrible still with the progress of time?

Unfortunately the evil answers but too well to the reigning temper of the times. The education of the schools finds no proper corrective in the tone of thought which prevails generally on the outside of the schools. Indeed if that were the case, no such education could be allowed to exist. It argues an eclipse of faith, that so great an interest can be thus passively surrendered, in a Christian land, to the power of unbelief. That must be at best a low sense of what religion is, which can suffer mere intellectual training in any view to be regarded as something of more account than virtue, piety, and holiness. It involves infidelity, to magnify such culture, as is commonly done in our time, at the expense of these higher interests; as though knowledge under any circumstances—and more especially an ability to read, write, and cast up accounts—must needs be a blessing to the possessor of it, and to the community at large; as though the whole problem of individual and social prosperity were to be successfully solved by the art of the schoolmaster, going abroad and letting light into human souls in such style; as though education, in any form like this, might be expected ever to do away with the evils of life, and to beautify it at last into anything like the character designed for it by God. Away with all such abominable glorification of mere naked mind, without any regard whatever to the wants and necessities of the immortal spirit! It is the very cant of infidelity itself. The chief end of man, is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. The "one thing needful" is not to *know* the shadows of this world, but to *be* in the powers of the world to come. The smallest measure of faith, is a higher accomplishment than any amount of learning without faith. Devout ignorance is infinitely better than profane unsanctified science. These are first truths, foundation maxims we may say, in the kingdom of Christ; and not to know

them, not to have them in mind, not to be spontaneously disposed to fall in with them at once as the only true order of thought and life, is necessarily to have the proper sense and glory of that kingdom obscured to our view, and to be thus to the same extent under the dominion of an opposite antichristian mind. That precisely is the ruling defect of our time. We read of what are called the "ages of faith." Ours, it is plain to see, is no such age. We glory in our intelligence; but it is more earthly in its order than heavenly. We boast of our improvements and arts; but they serve to fix our minds on material interests, far more than on such as are spiritual and divine. We exult in our general civilization, as though it carried in it somehow the promise of the Christian millennium itself, and might be taken for the harbinger of the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." But, alas, it is hard to see how it may be shown to be, either the product of those supernatural forces which are revealed to us by the Gospel, or the proper expression of their presence in the world, or a positive momentum in any way bearing them onward to their ultimate destination and end. It is not just the "wisdom and power of God unto salvation," we apprehend, in the old sense of St. Paul. The angel of St. John flying in the midst of heaven, and having the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation, kindred, and tongue, can hardly be expected to appear in any such form and shape.

We feel the full force of what Dr. Bushnell says on this subject. As an argument for the supernatural truth of Christianity, against the naturalistic tendencies of the age, his book is altogether timely. The evil enters into all spheres and departments of our modern life. It needs to be met in a bold and strong way. "We undertake the argument," says the distinguished author, "from a solemn conviction of its necessity, and because we see that the more direct arguments and appeals of religion are losing their power over the public mind and conscience. This is true especially of the young, who pass into life under the combined action of so many causes, conspiring to infuse a

distrust of whatever is supernatural in religion. Persons farther on in life are out of the reach of these new influences, and, unless their attention is specially called to the fact, have little suspicion of what is going on in the mind of the rising classes of the world—more and more saturated every day with this insidious form of unbelief. And yet we all, with perhaps the exception of a few who are too far on to suffer it, are more or less infected with the same tendency. Like an atmosphere, it begins to envelope the common mind of the world. We frequently detect its influence in the practical difficulties of the young members of the churches, who do not even suspect the true cause themselves. Indeed, there is nothing more common than to hear arguments advanced, and illustrations offered, by the most evangelical preachers, that have no force or meaning, save what they get from the current naturalism of the day. We have even heard a distinguished and carefully orthodox preacher deliver a discourse, the very doctrine of which was inevitable, unqualified naturalism. Logically taken, and carried out to its proper result, Christianity could have had no ground of standing left,—so little did the preacher himself understand the true scope of his doctrine, or the mischief that was beginning to infect his conceptions of the Christian truth."

Dr. Bushnell's argument for the supernatural, is made to rest centrally upon the person of Jesus Christ. This constitutes its main beauty and force. It forms the best distinction, and greatest merit, of the later modern theology generally, so far as it shows itself to be possessed of power and life, that it seeks more and more to make Christ in this way the principle of all faith and knowledge; taking up thus anew, as it were, the grand Christological views of the Nicene age, and laboring to carry them out in full order and harmony to their last results. Great praise is due here to the mighty genius of Schleiermacher; who, however defective his own views of the person of Christ were, may be said to have inaugurated a new era of theology in Germany, by forcing attention to this point as the true begin-

ning of all reality and certainty in religion. Under the inspiration of this thought, all theological studies there might seem to have started again into fresh vigorous life, rising from the tomb into which they had been cast by the melancholy reign of Rationalism in previous times. A new interest was felt to be infused into all the facts and doctrines of revelation, by the light which was shed upon them from the acknowledged centre of the Christian system. They acquired a deeper significance, and became in this way subjects for more earnest inquiry and profound study. Christological thinking—that which, instead of looking primarily to the things taught and done by Christ, fixes its whole gaze at once on the mystery of his person, the glorious fact of the incarnation, and uses this as a commentary and key for the right understanding of all things besides—has come to pervade and rule more or less all spheres of religious science. The method is so plainly founded in the very nature of Christianity, and grows forth so immediately from the apprehension of its supernatural character, that it must prevail more and more, not only in Germany, but in all other countries also, wherever it may be felt necessary to deal earnestly with the mysteries of religion, over against the growing naturalism of the age. If these are to be upheld successfully as objects of faith, transcending the constitution of nature, it can only be by falling back upon their ultimate ground in Christ, and asserting in the first place the absolute verity of his person, as the principle and source of what is thus to be regarded as a new creation altogether. Not only our systematic divinity, but our homiletic teaching also, needs to be fortified in this way against the downward tendency of the times, by being brought back to what is substantially the method of the old Apostles' Creed—that most simple, but at the same time most grand and sublime confession, into which, as a mould, the faith of the universal Church was cast in the beginning.

Nothing is more certain, than that Christ himself, as the author of the Gospel, claims for his own presence in the world a supernatural character, which is regarded as reach-

ing out to the whole Christian system also from his person. He is not of this world, according to his own declaration—not the efflorescence and perfection simply of its natural life in any view, but the introduction into it really and truly of life and power in a new and higher form. The great men of the heathen world, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and such like, with all the towering superiority of their nature, were nevertheless the historical product always of laws and forces belonging to humanity as it existed before. We may say the same also of such men as Moses, David, Isaiah, and the prophets generally, among the Jews. The supernatural as it appeared in them, and by them, was not properly of themselves, formed no part of their being, but met them, as it were, from abroad, in a sort of outward and transient way. Moses could not say: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." "I proceed forth and come from God"—"Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world"—"I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father"—"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." All men would be shocked with language any way approaching this, from his lips. But all is different with Jesus Christ. This exactly is the universal tenor of his language in regard to himself; and with such high assumption agrees in full the whole theory of the Gospel exhibited to us in the New Testament. In no other view is it intelligible. The strictly supernatural origin of Christ and his salvation is everywhere taken for granted, and rested upon silently as a first truth lying at the foundation of all its doctrines and facts; so that it is really one of the strangest things in the world, to find any class of men pretending to accept it as true in connection with any other hypothesis—so intimately interwoven this thought, of an order of existence higher than the whole constitution of the world as it stood before, would seem to be with what we may call the self-representation of the evangelical scheme at every point.

The position of Christ, his relations to the world, all the aspects of his character, all his works and all his pretensions, are brought into view everywhere as being in full unison and harmony with his bold claim to a heavenly and divine origin. His birth is by the Holy Ghost; on which account he is called the Son of God. Angels herald his advent into the world. The powers of heaven descend upon him at his baptism. He is no prophet simply among men, closing the Old Testament line, but the bearer of truth and grace in his own person. A new order of existence opens upon the world, in the mystery of his being. In him was life—life in its original, fonsal form—and the life became the light of men. It was not his office, therefore, primarily, to publish the truth as something different from himself, to mediate between earth and heaven, man and God, in any mere outward way. His own *being* constituted the deepest and last sense of the Gospel, the burden of its overwhelming mystery. “I am the way,” we hear him saying, “the truth, and the life”—not the index simply to these things, but the actual presence and power of the things themselves. “I am the resurrection and the life”—not the promise and pledge only of such glorious boon, but the full realization of it as a fact now actually at hand in my person. For “he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.” Again, “He that believeth on me hath everlasting life—Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.” God was in him, reconciling the world unto himself. He is the propitiation for our sins—our righteousness—our peace—the organism of our redemption—the everlasting theatre of our salvation. He stands in the world a vast stupendous miracle—the miracle of a new creation. He is greater than all the powers, higher than all the glories of the natural world. Nay, he is before all things, and by him, and in him, all things consist. His life, therefore, included in itself, from the beginning, even under its human form, the principle of full

victory over all the vanity and misery which are in the world through sin; so that when he went down into the grave, and descended into hades, it was only that he might return again, leading captivity captive, and ascend up on high, to inaugurate his kingdom, in its proper spiritual form, as a new immortal constitution, against which the gates of hell should have no power to prevail to the end of time.

So lofty, so wide, so every way large, beyond all the measures of man's merely natural life, or simply human history, are the terms and representations in which the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in wonderful, unfaltering consistency with itself throughout, bears witness to its own origin, character, and power. If it be not in the fullest sense—first in the person of Christ himself, and then in the outworkings and ongoing of his grace and power in the system of Christianity as a whole—the presence of a new supernatural life in the world, an order of existence which was not in it before, and which is not in it still beyond the reach and range of this fact; if it be not this, we say, and nothing short of this, then must it be denounced at once as being the most daring and wicked imposture ever practiced upon the credulity of the human race.

But let any one pause now, to consider what an amount of peril is involved in so vast and broad a claim, and to what an ordeal Christianity has necessarily subjected itself, in presuming to take this lofty position, and thus binding itself to satisfy in full the terms and conditions of its own world-embracing problem. A consistent fiction is hard in any case, where it has to do with concrete realities under a known form, and is allowed to extend itself at all to specific details; but it becomes of course more and more difficult, and at last is found to be utterly impracticable, in proportion precisely as the points to be met and answered in this way become more and more significant, multitudinous, and complex. Suppose Christianity then to be such an invention—a bold hypothesis merely, got up to solve the

inmost meaning of the world's life, and to play off in spectral style a supernatural economy of salvation commensurate with all the wants and aspirations of our fallen race—and how certainly may it not be expected to break down, by its own incongruities and contradictions, almost immediately at every point. Never did a scheme of religion, surely, offer itself of its own accord to a more searching trial of its merits and claims.

For the supernatural here is no transient phenomenon merely, no fantastic avatar, no theophany only in the Old Testament style; much less a doctrine simply, or theosophic speculation. It is made to challenge our faith and homage, as an abiding fact, linking itself organically with the general life of the world, and carrying it out historically to its highest and last sense. It must then be supremely natural, as well as overwhelmingly supernatural; no product of nature plainly, and yet in such harmony with it, that it shall seem to be at the same time its full outbursting glory and necessary perfection. The relation between God's first creation, and that which claims to be in this way God's second creation, may not be conceived of as contradictory, violent, or abrupt. The divine economy which embraces both—proceeding, as it does, from the mind of Him to whom all his works are known from the beginning—must be a single system at last, in absolute harmony with itself throughout.

The whole constitution of the world, therefore, both physical and moral, must be found to come to its proper conclusion in Christ, showing him to be in very deed the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, of all God's works.

The physical must show itself every where the mirror of the spiritual and heavenly, as these come out fully at last only in the form of Christianity. Not as having any power to make them known by its own light originally; but as answering to them, in the way of universal parable, when it comes to be shone upon from their higher sphere; even as to the mind of Christ himself, the birds of the air, and

the flowers of the field, become types and symbols of righteousness at once, the moment they are needed for any such purpose.

In its whole organization again, the physical, as being plainly a progressive order of things reaching towards the unity of some common end, must put on the character of a ground preparation and prophecy, from first to last, looking continually to the advent of Christ as the only sufficient fulfilment of its sense. This it will be found to do, if it have no power to stop in its own order, or to come to an end in itself, but be forced and driven, as it were, upward and forward always, from one stage and level of existence to another—each lower range foreshadowing still the necessary approach of a higher—till it gains its full summit finally in man ; and so transcends itself, if we may use such an expression, in the presence of a new *moral* world, which afterwards again shows itself in its own turn unable in like manner to come to any pause or rest, till it is filled out and made complete by the supernatural grace of the Gospel.

It will be then, more especially, as tried by the actual conditions of this moral world—the circumstances and necessities of our general human life—that the Christian system, in the view now under consideration, must pass through its severest ordeal. Its theory of humanity must be such as to fall in plainly with the actual condition of humanity in the world; while all the lines of history, and all the deeper forces of man's life, shall be found every where struggling toward it, and either consciously or unconsciously bearing witness to its claims.

The general fact of man's sin and misery must be such, as to agree with the hypothesis of a strictly supernatural redemption. If the evil were found to be of a superficial character only, neither deeper nor broader in fact than the measure of our life in its ordinary natural form—and in such view capable, accordingly, of being surmounted in some way by the powers and possibilities of this life in its own sphere,—the idea of a redemption descending into it from above, in the form of a new creation brought to pass

by the mystery of the Incarnation, would be convicted at once of being unreasonable and false. To justify any such mystery, it must appear that sin is a disorder which underlies the universal nature of man as it now stands ; that it is itself a sort of supernatural fall or lapse in his life ; that the whole present order of his existence is subjected to vanity and death by reason of it ; that all other remedial agencies brought to bear upon the case, philosophical, educational, political, socialistic, and such like, have proved themselves thus far, and must prove themselves, utterly inadequate to its demands, coming, as it were, infinitely short of the last ground and seat of the evil ; that it can be conquered, therefore, and rolled back in its consequences, if conquered ever at all, only by a force deeper and more comprehensive than the whole order of the world in its natural view, which, as such, shall show itself sufficient at the same time to break through this order altogether, and to rise above it, abolishing death itself, and bringing life and immortality to light. The New Testament doctrine of Christ, involved necessarily a corresponding doctrine of man. No Pelagian Anthropology, denying or slurring over the fact of Original Sin, can move hand in hand, in one and the same line, with a strictly theanthropic Christology.

It must appear still farther, if Christianity be true, that the religious life of the world generally, under what may be denominated its merely natural form, looks toward it, calls for it, reaches after it in all manner of ways, and finds the burden of its dark riddle fully solved at last only in its august presence. Rooted as they are in the same ground, the constitution of human nature itself, all religions must have to some extent a common character, must be concerned with the same problems, must work themselves out into more or less analogous results. The relation then of the absolutely true religion to religions that are false, can not be regarded as one of abrupt and total difference ; it should be taken rather to resemble the relation that holds between man in the natural creation, and the manifold forms of animal life in the world below him—which, however far they

may fall short of his perfection, carry in themselves, notwithstanding, though it may be in very distorted and fantastic style, some portion still of the idea which is finally disclosed in his person, and thus join in foreshadowing this darkly from all sides as their own last end and only proper meaning. False religions, in such view, should open a wide field of analogical comparison, serving to establish the idea of religion in its true form ; not as leading over to it in their own order, not as being on the same plane with it in any sense ; but as bringing into view wants, aspirations, questions, problems, soul-mysteries in every shape, which only the true religion at last is able fully to satisfy and solve. Should the grand supernatural facts and doctrines of Christianity seem to be met in this way with dull echoes, and wild visionary caricatures, of their heavenly sense, in the mythologies of the heathen world, the fact would form certainly no ground of objection to its claims, but only a powerful argument in their favor. Heathenism *ought* to be, in such manner, through its whole wide empire of darkness and sin, an unconscious prophecy of Him, who proclaims himself the desire of all nations and the light of the world.

All History again must come to its proper unity in Christ, if he be indeed what he is made to be in the Gospel. Here, as in the constitution of Nature, God must have a plan in harmony with itself throughout ; and this plan can not possibly go aside from his main thought and purpose in the government of the world. It must centre in the Incarnation.

Then after all this, what a range of comparison and trial for the Christian system is presented to us in the general economy of Revelation itself. For this is no single or narrow fact simply ; nor yet a multitude of separate, disjointed facts ; but a vast and mighty organization of facts rather, involving the most manifold relations, and reaching through long ages back to the very beginning of the world. Religion in this form is exhibited to us under different dispensations, and yet as being always the same, from the first obscure promise in the garden of Eden, down to the

fulness of time, when the Word became flesh and tabernacled among men in the person of Jesus Christ. "God," we are told, "who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." All these voices of old then—in paradise, before the flood and after the flood, through the patriarchs, in the giving of the law, and by the whole long line of the prophets from Moses down to the ministry of John the Baptist—must come together at last in Christ as their only full sense and necessary end. The correspondence cannot limit itself to a few predictions and types, put forward here and there in an abstract outward way; it must enter into the universal structure of the entire revelation. The Old Testament throughout must be, not only in full harmony with itself, but in full organic union at the same time with the central idea of the New Testament; so that everywhere, in all its oracles, histories, and institutions, it shall be found prefiguring this, reaching toward it, and laboring as it were to find in it its own true rest and glorious consummation.

But by far the most difficult part of the whole problem, it is plain, must be finally to satisfy what we may call the internal conditions and requirements of this New Testament idea itself; by setting it forth in such a form, that it shall appear to be every way worthy of itself, and true throughout to its own constituent terms. Only think, what is involved in an attempt to *construct* a full historical Christ in the manner of the Gospel. Not only to dare so bold a thought as that of the Incarnation, but to dare also beyond this the reduction of such a thought to full artistic representation, in the form of an actual human life; to project and carry out a biography of "God manifest in the flesh," the Word Incarnate, in whom dwelt the "fulness of the Godhead bodily;" the portraiture of such a character, the picture of such a life, brought down to particulars and details; and exhibited as moving, speaking, acting and working, through a course of years, in the midst of actual

human relations—the whole so ordered as to show itself in all its connections, antecedents, and consequents, harmoniously consistent with the grand fundamental thought on which it is made to rest. It is not possible surely to conceive of an ordeal more severe, than that to which Christianity has subjected itself, in coming before the world with its history of Jesus Christ, as we have it briefly outlined in the Apostles' Creed, from his miraculous birth of the Virgin, on to his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension to the right hand of God. For so coming in the flesh, he must have an advent answerable to the glorious mystery of his person ; such as shall bring with it the full presence of a new creation, and yet serve to set him really and truly in the bosom of the old creation. He must have a mission commensurate with his nature. He must be at once perfectly human, and yet no less perfectly divine, in all his teachings and doings. He must be in the world, as being all the time above it, and as comprising in himself the power of a life destined to triumph over it at last through all ages. His history may not end in the grave ; and just as little may it come to a Gnostic conclusion in the clouds. Such a manifestation in the flesh must justify itself in the spirit ; opening the way for a new order of grace among men, that shall be found in fair keeping to the end of time with the vastness of the economy serving thus for its introduction—a thought which leads at once to the idea of the Church, exactly in the order of the Creed, as being the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

The terms and conditions of the Christian problem being in such general view what we have now seen them to be, the truth of Christianity, it is easy to see, must turn mainly on its power to solve them in a satisfactory way ; and in such case, this must be taken always as the first and strongest of all arguments in its favor. Indeed no argument can be of force aside from this. The Christian Evidence thus centres ultimately in Christ himself. He is emphatically the "Light of the world." For the natural cannot reveal,

or make certain in any way, the supernatural; but needs this rather to bring out clearly its own sense; and so Christ descending into the world as the fullest and most perfect revelation of the supernatural, must be regarded necessarily as the very principle and source of all real illumination for men. As the absolute truth, he must in the nature of the case prove and authenticate himself.

This, however, does not imply of course that little or no account is to be made of evidences for the truth of Christianity beyond the person of Christ; miracles, for example, prophecies, types, providences, voices of nature and grace conspiring in its favor. It goes only to hold such proofs to their right order and place. Their proper force lies in their organic relation to the presence of Christ himself in the world. They bear witness to him, only by means of the significance and power which they themselves derive from his person. They are the necessary seals of his supernatural mission; which however have force, like all seals, only as they are attached to what they thus serve to authenticate, and not as torn from it, and viewed in any separate and independent way.

The main weight of the argument for the supernatural, in Dr. Bushnell's book, is made to rest on Christ, as being the grand first principle of proof in this order of existence—an order which completes itself fully at last only in the fact of the Incarnation. "The character and doctrine of Jesus," we are told, "are the sun that holds all the minor orbs of revelation to their places, and pours a sovereign self-evidencing light into all religious knowledge." Still, before coming to this, the first part of the work is very properly occupied with the subject under a more general view; the purpose being to show, that the supernatural itself is not something absolutely foreign and strange to the constitution of the world in its natural form, but an order rather which is anticipated and called for by this, and that comes out at last, therefore, in full harmony with its deepest wants, in full explication, we may say, of its inmost meaning and sense.

Here we find a great deal, of course, that is entitled to our admiring interest and attention, as going to establish, in the way of analogical and presumptive reasoning, both the possibility and the necessity of the supernatural, considered as being the proper complement or filling out of the natural—both joining to constitute what the book denominates “the one system of God.” The argument, however, as conducted by Dr. Bushnell, is made to involve and assert some things which it seems to us not easy to allow.

In the first place, we demur to his line of distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Nature he defines to be the simply physical order of the world, made up of causes and effects flowing in constant succession, by a necessity that comes from within the scheme itself; in which view, we are told, “that is supernatural, whatever it be, that is either not in the chain of natural cause and effect, or which acts on the chain of cause and effect in nature, from without the chain.” In this way, the supernatural is brought to assume at once a most familiar every day character, by entering into the very conception of our own personality; for this, as involving intelligence and will, is not under the law of cause and effect in the manner of the simply physical world, but carries in itself the power of acting on the course of this law from without, in a free self-determining way, so as to produce results, that nature of itself, as here defined, could not bring to pass.

Now it is perfectly fair, to make use of this relation of mind to matter in the world, as an analogical argument for the possibility of an intervention, that shall be found descending into the world miraculously from a higher sphere. But it is pushing the matter too far, we think, to make the first relation of one order, and parallel in full, with the second. That is not the common view of the case certainly; and the interest of the supernatural is likely to lose by it in the end, it strikes us, much more than it may seem at first sight to gain. As distinguished from the supernatural, in the old theological sense—which is at the same time here also the popular sense—the natural includes in its

conception a great deal more than the simply material and physical. The term is often used indeed to express the idea of difference from the moral ; but never so as to refer this last to the supernatural. When *that* distinction is to be expressed, the moral itself is made to fall at once, along with the physical, into the economy of nature. This includes in its constitution mind as well as matter, self-determining forces or powers as well as simply passive chains of cause and effect. Man belongs primarily to the present world ; he is incorporated into it organically from his birth; his relations to it are part of its proper system, quite as much as the conditions and laws of things below him. True, he possesses in himself, at the same time, the capacity of a higher life, original and constitutional relations to an order of existence far more glorious than the present world, the powers of which must be brought to bear upon him in a most real way, if he is to fulfil at last the great purpose of his creation. But this does not of itself lift him out of the order of nature. It shows only how truly he is in it, as needing thus the power of the supernatural, under an objective form, to perfect his existence in that higher view.

We are by no means satisfied, in the next place, with Dr. Bushnell's theory of the origin of evil. Sin, if we understand him rightly, is not only a bad possibility in any such world as ours, but a tremendous necessity. He holds indeed that our first parents were created in a state of "constituent perfection," having an inward fitness and disposition for good, that served to carry them toward it spontaneously without or before deliberation. But holiness in such form can have no sufficient strength or security. "Deliberation, when it comes, as come it must, will be the inevitable fall of it ; and then when the side of counsel in them is sufficiently instructed by that fall, and the bitter sorrow it yields, and the holy freedom is restored, it may be or become an eternally enduring principle. Spontaneity in good, without counsel, is weak ; counsel and deliberative choice, without spontaneity, are only a character begun ; issued in

spontaneity, they are the solid reality of everlasting good." It does not help the case materially, to say that there was no positive ground or cause for sin in man's nature; and that our first parents fell by their own free choice. The difficulty is, that their free choice is supposed here to be so circumstanced, in the way of "privative conditions," as to be absolutely shut up to this conclusion and no other. "The *certainty* of their sin," we are told, "is originally involved in their spiritual training as powers." Their condition privative was such as to involve "their *certain lapse* into evil."

Sin is made to be thus a necessary transitional stage, in the process of full moral development. The condition of man in Paradise was not, and could not be, a direct onward movement in its own form to confirmed holiness, and so to glory, honor, and eternal life. It was necessary that he should taste evil, in order to become afterwards intelligently and resolutely good. His innocence could be strengthened into its full ripe virtue, only by being required to descend into the rough arena of the world through the fall, for the purpose of needful discipline and probation. This is not a new thought by any means. We recognize in it the familiar face of a speculation, which in one form or another has made itself altogether common in much of the thinking of modern Germany. But we do not consider it for this reason any the less wrong. It agrees not with the old doctrine of the Church on the subject; and the natural sense of the Bible is against it. It turns the Garden of Eden into a mere allegory or myth. It seats the necessity of sin in the very constitution of the world itself; a view, which goes at once to overthrow its character as sin, making it indeed the fruit of man's freedom in form, but so conditioning this freedom, that it is found to be only another name at last for what is in fact inevitable fate.

Dr. Bushnell carries his view of the certainty of man's fall so far, as to hold that the entire natural constitution of the world was ordered and established by God from the beginning with reference to that terrible fact; which in

such view, therefore, could be no doubtful or uncertain contingency in any sense, but must be considered rather as forming from the very start the fixed central pivot and hinge, we may say, on which the whole plan of the world was made to turn. Sin thus has its disordering consequences in the natural creation, not simply as they are found coming *after* it in time; but also, on a much broader scale it would seem, as they have been made in God's plan to go before it, in the form of dispositions and arrangements contrived prospectively to anticipate its advent, and to lead over to it finally as the full interpretation of their own sense. Even the long geologic ages, stretching away back of the Adamic creation, are taken to be prelusive throughout in this way of the surely coming fact of sin. "This whole tossing, rending, recomposing process, that we call geology," our author tells us, "symbolizes evidently, as in highest reason it should, the grand spiritual catastrophe, and Christian new creation, of man; which, both together, comprehend the problem of mind, and so the final causes or last ends of all God's works. What we see, is the beginning conversing with the end, and Eternal Forethought reaching across the tottering mountains and boiling seas, to unite beginning and end together. So that we may hear the grinding layers of the rocks singing harshly:

Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree—

and all the long eras of desolation, and refitted bloom and beauty, represented in the registers of the world, are but the epic in stone of man's great history, before the time."

On all this, we venture here no particular criticism. The subject, in the hands of Dr. Bushnell, is full of imagination and poetry, while it is made to overflow at the same time with rich suggestive thought. Our great embarrassment with it is, that, by making the universal order of the world dependent centrally upon the fall of man, and the introduction of sin, it makes this no less necessary than the geologic cataclysms, that owe their existence to it anticipatively so many ages before. Calvin's supralapsarianism,

and the pantheistic world-progress of Hegel, seem to us always to run out here to the same conclusion, a Manichean notion of sin on the one hand, and as the necessary counterpart of this, a Gnostic conception of redemption on the other.

Through whatever stages of imperfection and disorder our world may have passed previously to the Mosaic creation, described in the first chapter of Genesis, we know that it was then at least pronounced by God himself to be in all respects "very good." There can be no doubt, too, that this goodness, in the view of the sacred narrative, was held to consist in its full correspondence with the nature of man as he stood before the fall. The world was good, not in the light of a penitentiary prepared beforehand to suit the circumstances of his case in a state of sin, but as a fit theatre for the free harmonious development of his life in a state of innocence. How the fall wrought to disturb this original order, is of course a great mystery. It may have been largely by changes and privations induced upon the nature of man himself, causing the world to be in its relations to him something wholly different from what it would be if he were not thus hurled down from his first estate, and making it impossible for him even to conceive now of what might be comprehended for him in any such normal order. One thing is certain ; had he continued sinless, the law of death, as it prevails in nature, could not have extended itself to his person ; and how much of superiority this might have involved, in other respects, to the constitutional vanity and misery of the world as we now find it, no one may pretend surely to say.

Dr. Bushnell's idea of the necessity of sin extends logically to all worlds. Even the good angels, spoken of in the Scriptures, he tells us, "for aught that appears, have all been passed through and brought up out of a fall, as the redeemed of mankind will be." The celebrated Christian philosopher, Richard Rothe—one of the profoundest thinkers of the age—adopts the same thought, we remember, in his *Theological Ethics*. We let it pass here without further remark.

We have been somewhat surprised to find Dr. Bushnell denying also the proper personality of Satan. He allows the existence of evil spirits; but is not willing to admit the idea of their organization under any single head. Satan, he tells us, is a collective term simply, designating "the all or total of bad minds and powers." This is neither biblical, we think, nor ecclesiastical—though it be supported, curiously enough, by the authority of *Davenport*, "the ablest theologian of all the New England Fathers." It detracts also seriously, in our opinion, from the objective realness, and full historical significance, of the work of redemption, regarded as an actual supernatural conflict between the powers of light and the powers of darkness. A real personal Satan seems necessary, to bring out in full relief the idea of a real personal Christ. And so far as the danger of any Manichean dualism is concerned, we do not see that we are brought so nigh to it by any means in this way, as by the hypothesis of our respected author himself; which, as we have seen, makes sin to be a necessary thing—a fact *sure* to come to pass—in the very constitution of the world itself. It carries indeed to our ear, we must confess, a very Zoroastrish sound, when we are told up and down, that evil is "a bad possibility that environs God from eternity, waiting to become a fact, and certain to become a fact, whenever the opportunity is given;" so that, "the moment God creates a realm of powers, the bad possibility as certainly becomes a bad actuality—an outbreaking evil, or empire of evil, in created spirits, according to their order."

We have said, that the great merit of Dr. Bushnell's book, as a plea for the supernatural, is its Christological character. Its argument centres in Jesus Christ; whose whole personality, as we have it portrayed in the Gospel, is shown with great beauty and force to be an altogether superhuman fact, and such a self-evidencing miracle in its own nature, as may well be considered sufficient to flood with the light of heavenly demonstration the universal *kosmos* of the new creation. And yet we do not feel after all, that

enough is made still of the significance in this view of the great "mystery of godliness," as related to the supernatural on the one side and to the world of nature on the other.

The revelation of the supernatural in and by Christ is not of one kind, with the revelation of it in any other way. Nature in its own order needs the supernatural, reaches after it, and through the human spirit aspires toward it continually as the necessary outlet and complement of its last wants. This aspiration, however, is in itself something negative merely, which as such can have no power of course ever to grasp the supernatural or to bring it down to its own sphere; for what nature might so fetch into itself by powers of its own would be no longer *super-natural*; the negative want or *nibus* here must be met, by a positive self-representation of its object from the other side. In these circumstances, there is room for imaginary or false relations to thrust themselves in as substitutes for the true. Men may invest their own speculative fancies and dreams—the shadowy projections of their spiritual nature itself reaching forth toward the dark void—with a sort of spurious objectivity; thus creating for themselves whole worlds of religion, that shall be found to mimic and caricature the truth in its proper form. Again, the powers of the invisible world may play into the economy of nature in an irregular, abnormal way, through Satanic inlets, offering themselves to the inward craving of the human spirit, as the very presence and sense of the supernatural which it needs for its perfection, and so hurrying it away, by the force of its religious instincts themselves, into a still more gloomy region of horrible unrealities and lies. To this sphere belong the sorcery, magic, and witchcraft of all ages, as well as the oracles and wonders of the heathen world generally, as far as it may be necessary to admit their more than natural character; and we have no hesitation, in referring to it also—as Dr. Bushnell does too—the so called "spiritual manifestations" of our own day, on the supposition of their being what they pretend to be and not mere tricks of jugglery; a question which it is not necessary

here to discuss. The world, however, God be praised, has not been left hopelessly to the dominion of these phantoms and lies, growing out of such false relations to the supernatural. The truth has descended into it, under its own proper form. This is the idea of Revelation.

In one view, nature itself is a divine revelation. A supernatural presence underlies it, and works through it, at every point. But still as man now is, he has no power to come by this to any right knowledge of God, and much less to any firm and steady apprehension of a higher order of life in his presence. Hence an actual coming down of God into the world under a wholly new form, becomes the proper full sense of the supernatural as required now to meet our wants. Revelation, so understood, is a single fact; announcing its own advent by heavenly oracles and signs, making room for itself more and more by preliminary heaven-appointed dispensations, from the time of Adam down to the time of John the Baptist; but bursting forth at last, in its whole reality and glory, only in the ever-adorable mystery of the Incarnation. The supernatural in Christ thus is not in one line simply with the supernatural exhibited in previous divine revelations, a fact ranking high and conclusive among other facts of like superhuman order; it is the organic root rather of all true revelation from the beginning of the world; the one absolute truth in this form, which, coming in the fulness of time, makes good finally the sense of all previous oracles and outshinings from behind the veil, disclosing the real ground of them in its own presence. And being so related to what went before in the way of prophetic word and type, with still more certainty must the mystery be organically joined with all that comes after it, in the progressive unfolding of the Christian salvation. The Incarnation constitutes the gospel—being in its very nature a new revelation of God in the world, by which the life of heaven is made to unite itself with the life of earth, in a real abiding way, so as to bring the supernatural home to men in a form fully answerable to their inmost wants. In such view, it is the

beginning of a new order of existence, the principle of a new creation, which in the nature of the case must hold under an objective, historical character, as something different from the world in its simply natural constitution, on to the end of time. This is the old Patristic idea of the Holy Catholic Church ; and it is not difficult surely to see how, in the light of the subject as thus explained, so much account should have been made of it from the first, as being absolutely necessary for the full carrying out of the Christian mystery to its proper end.

We have the feeling, as we have said, that Dr. Bushnell's system of the supernatural, with all its Christological merit, fails somehow after all to lay hold of the full significance of the Incarnation, in the broad organic view now mentioned. In such way, we mean, as to make this, not merely the greatest of all arguments for the supernatural in a general view, but the absolute whole revelation of it, in the only form in which it can ever be truly and steadily objective to faith, and practically efficient for the purposes of redemption ; so that all relations to it, all communications with it, on the outside of this great Mystery of Godliness, can never be anything better than relative only, dream-like, apparitional, or it may be absolutely magical, demoniacal, and false. For Rationalism, it should ever be borne in mind, has two sides, two opposite poles of unbelief, that are forever playing into each other with wonderful readiness and ease ; an abstract naturalism on the one hand, that owns no reality higher than the present world ; and then an abstract spiritualism on the other hand, by which the sense of the supernatural is not allowed to come to any real union with the sense of the natural in the way of faith, but is made to float over it fantastically in the way of mere Gnostic imagination. The one absolute Truth, according to St. John, as against both these antichristian extremes, is the real coming of Christ in the flesh (1 John 4: 1-8) ; in making earnest with which under such view, it is not easy to see how faith should not feel itself constrained to make like earnest also with the old doctrine of the Church.

This doctrine, we are sorry to say, struggles in vain throughout Dr. Bushnell's book to come to its proper clear and full expression ; and the want of it, in our view, is a serious defect in his otherwise admirable Christological argument. He shows indeed at various points the power of churchly ideas—for all profound thinking on the historical significance of Christ's person *must* run more or less that way ; he is ready enough too, of course, to acknowledge the existence of the Church in the general New England sense; but the conception of the Church, as it is made to be an article of faith, a first principle or ground element of Christianity, in the Apostles' Creed, and in all the ancient Creeds, has seemingly no place in his system whatever.

Thus the Gospel seems to be regarded by him too commonly, in the light of a constitution or fact qualifying the natural condition of the world generally in a supernatural way, and setting it in new relations to God within its old order of life ; in virtue of which, it may be supposed capable then of coming at once, on its own level, within the range and scope of the powers of redemption, flowing around it spiritually at all times like the air of heaven. Whereas the mystery of the new creation in Christ would appear plainly to require, that we should conceive of it, not as any such system of heavenly possibilities added to the world in its general natural character, but as an objective constitution rather, having place in the world under a wholly different form, and carrying in itself relations and powers altogether peculiar, and not to be found anywhere beyond its own limits ; an order of supernatural grace, into which men must be introduced first of all, (the old ecclesiastical idea of re-birth through the sacrament of baptism,) by an outward "obedience of faith," in order that they may come into the full use afterwards of its quickening and saving help. Any such view must necessarily exclude Dr. Bushnell's suggestion, that a regenerate life may be capable of passing, like the corruption of the race, by natural propagation, "under the well known laws of physiol-

ogy," from parents to children; as it demands also a material qualification of a good deal that he says besides, on the subject of Christian experience, the work of the Spirit, and the new creation in Christ Jesus.

It is owing to this want of ecclesiastical feeling, no doubt, that Dr. Bushnell falls in so readily with the stereotyped Puritanic way of thinking in regard to the historical Church of past ages, by which it is made to be from the beginning, a systematic falling away from the proper sense of the Gospel, in all its points of difference from the prevalent spiritualism of modern times. In one of his chapters, we have an argument to show, that "the world is governed supernaturally in the interest of Christianity;" which, carried out in any sort of consistency with itself, would seem to involve necessarily a powerful presumption in favor of the old Catholic Church—the only form, in which, by general acknowledgment now, the truth of Christianity was maintained, through long ages, against all manner of infidelities and heresies seeking its destruction. But our author's theory will not allow the argument in any such way as that—he contrives to find here a wheel within a wheel, an esoteric *under-sense*, by which the outward complexion and first impression of God's providence are made to be one thing, and its hidden ulterior meaning another thing altogether. We are gravely told, accordingly, that Christianity *must* "go into a grand process of corruption at first," to make room for its own regeneration finally to a higher and better life. And so if the course of events, century after century, fall in concurrently with the march of Christianity in this false shape, verifying apparently in the fortunes of the Catholic Church the symbol of the bush that burned with fire and yet was not consumed, we are not to be moved by it at all as proving anything in favor of the Church, but to read in it on the contrary only a profound ordering of God's providence, designed to open the way for its ultimate confusion and defeat. Need we say that the providential, or historical, argument for Christianity, in any such form as this, is shorn of all force, and turn-

ed into a mere arbitrary conceit, which is capable of being used ingeniously with as much effect one way as another?

We have been pleased to find, that Dr. Bushnell does not shrink from confessing the continuation of the power of miracles in the Church, making them to be on fit occasions both possible and actual, from the first century down to the present time. We have long felt, that the popular notion on the subject, which supposes them to have continued for about three centuries after Christ, and then to have ceased entirely, is both against reason and without any sort of proper support in history. The proof for miracles *after* the third century is altogether more full and clear, than the proof for miracles in the second and third centuries themselves. The real possibility of them, moreover, would seem to lie in the very conception of Christianity, considered as an order of supernatural powers enduringly present in the world to the end of time ; so that one is at a loss to understand, what kind of faith in it *they* can have, who make a merit of mocking and scouting every miraculous pretension in its name, as being at once, and of itself, the surest evidence of gross imposture or blind superstition. With such irrational and irreligious skepticism our Hartford divine has no sympathy. He believes in the continuation of the power of miracles in the Church, down even to our own day ; and more than that, he brings forward quite a number of what he considers well authenticated examples of the miraculous in modern times, which have fallen in some measure under his own observation. It is curious to read his chapter on this subject.

Here again, however, we are struck with the *unchurchly* spirit of his thinking. The old ecclesiastical miracles are not wholly to his taste ; their ecclesiasticism at least seems to be counted a hindrance to their credibility, more than a help. His faith in such things appears to breathe most free, when it passes out of that order, and is allowed to expatiate at large among wonders more or less extra-ecclesiastical in their form and character. We shall not pretend, of course, to enter here into any examination of his

cases. We must say, however, that Church miracles in the proper sense—miracles, we mean, as mediated by the idea of the Church in the old Augustinian view—are vastly more respectable, in our eyes, than any such class of examples under a different and more general type. We question, indeed, if it be possible to make earnest with the belief-of miracles at all, except in connection with some believing apprehension of the mystery of the Church, in the sense of the Apostles' Creed. Out of that order, the supernatural as related to the present world, would seem to carry with it always, even under its best and most reliable manifestations, a certain character of Gnostic unreality, making it to be no proper object for steady Christian faith. We have been much struck with the frank confession of Dr. Bushnell himself, after all his examples, in regard to this point. "As regards the general truth," he tells us, "that supernatural facts, such as healings, tongues, and other gifts, may as well be manifested now as at any former time, and that there never has been a formal discontinuance, I am perfectly satisfied. I know no proof to the contrary, that appears to me to have a straw's weight. And yet, when I come to the question of being in such gifts, or of receiving into easy credit those who appear to be, I acknowledge that for some reason, either because of some latent subjection to the conventionalities of philosophy, or to the worse conventionalities of sin, belief does not follow, save in a somewhat faltering and equivocal way." But so it is, he adds, with many great questions of God and immortality. "The arguments are good and clear, but, for some reason, they do not make faith, and we are still surprised to find, in our practice, that we only doubtfully believe. To believe these supernatural things, in the form of particular facts, is certainly difficult; and how conscious are we, as we set ourselves to the questions, of the weakness of our vacillations! Pardon us, Lord, that when we make so much of mere credibilities and rationalities of opinion, we are yet so slow to believe that what we have shown to be credible and rational, is actually coming to pass."

Verily, it is a great thing to have faith, even as a grain of mustard seed ; to be able to own and embrace, not merely the thought of the supernatural in a natural way, but the real presence of it in its own order ; to hold the proper verity of the Gospel, not in the form of doctrine only, or supposed inward experiences, but in the form of full objective, historical fact. To be able to say the Creed, in its own meaning and sense. To stand before the Man Jesus, and confess, with more than natural knowledge, as Peter did : “ *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*” To believe that “ Christ is come in the flesh,” with all the necessary antecedents, concomitants, and consequents of such a revelation ; his birth of the Virgin, full of grace, and blessed among women ; his miracles in the days of his flesh ; his resurrection and ascension ; his new presence in the world by the Spirit ; the supernatural order of the Church, set over against the order of nature, and comprehending in itself the powers of his resurrection life to the end of time. This is the Gospel, as we find it preached everywhere in the Acts of the Apostles—as it underlies all the New Testament Epistles—as it animated the spirit of martyrs and confessors in the first Christian ages ; and the power of believing it, we repeat, is indeed so great a thing, that all worldly advantages in comparison, may well seem to be both poor and mean. Such faith, from the very nature of the case, must be itself supernatural—the power of passing beyond nature, so as to lay hold of things heavenly and divine in their own higher order and sphere. It must come into the soul then in and through the constitution of grace itself, under its character of objective distinction from the constitution of man’s merely natural life. There may be actings of the organ or faculty, indeed, on the outside of this ; but these will be always in a more or less Gnostic and unreal way; forms of believing, we may say, filled as yet with no proper contents of faith ; the virtue can come to full exercise in the bosom of the Christian mystery alone. And what now if the standing form of this mystery in the world be still the Church, as it was

held to be in the beginning? Could faith do its office, in that case, while denying, despising, ignoring, or overlooking its claims? One use of his argument for the supernatural Dr. Bushnell finds in this, that it provides a place and a plea for the "positive institutions of religion," as he calls them—meaning by these, church organization, the sacraments, the Sabbath, the Bible, the office of the ministry, &c.—which are allowed to be "falling rapidly into disrespect, as if destined finally to be quite lost or sunk in oblivion." This fact itself he ascribes to the growth and pervading influence of naturalism. But may we not reverse the order, and make the loss of belief—we will not say in the positive institutions of Christianity—but in the Christian Church itself, one large cause of the reigning decay of faith in a wider view? To restore the supernatural to its general rights, then, nothing would be needed so much, first of all, as a resuscitation of faith in the Church. Then, also, any argument for the supernatural, any plea for the Christological in its sound and right form, to be of full force and effect in the end, must be at the same time ecclesiastical also, or, in other words, an argument for the old doctrine of the Church, as it stands enshrined in the early Creeds. Is it too much to hope, that Dr. Bushnell's earnest and active mind may yet be turned to the subject, under this profoundly interesting view?

Lancaster, Pa.

J. W. N.

ART. III.—THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF WASHINGTON.*

THE subject of this article is called by LORD BROUHAM, "the **GREATEST man of our own, or any age.**" "It will," he adds, "be the duty of the historian and the sage, in all ages, to let no occasion pass, of commemorating this illustrious man; and until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue, be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington." This ingenuous and merited tribute to distinguished worth, will ever meet a cheering response in the heart of every true American. It stands associated, in the past and memorable history of our republic, with prerogatives and blessings, unsurpassed, by any people under heaven.

In the contemplation of our present greatness and pre-eminent civil and religious privileges, our thoughts recur not only to Him, who is the source of all good, but to the men also by whom the foundation of this greatness was laid and through whom these privileges were conferred. We are led back to that period in our country's history, when our patriot fathers bought these blessings with their blood,—when not only vigorous youth rushed forth to meet in deadly combat the invading foe, but the aged and infirm, as if suddenly inspired with the ardor and strength of manhood, hastened to the rescue of their precious heritage from the grasp of their oppressors. Among the noble worthies of that dark and mournful period, there looms into view the form of him, to whom it will ever be our pride and love to award this praise: "*First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.*"

The illustrious founder of our great republic possessed a

* For the authorities quoted in the preparation of this article, the reader is referred to Dr. Shroder's "Maxims of Washington," 1855, and Weems' life of Washington.

character far higher, however, than it is in the power of mere *human* excellence to develop. It must ever be regarded as a matter of incalculable importance, and a most gracious allotment of Divine Providence, that our beloved Washington was a man who feared God and loved righteousness. He did not only present to his countrymen a singular instance of military valor and glory—of unexampled statesmanship—of unbending integrity and disinterested patriotism, but also of genuine and unaffected piety. Washington was emphatically a *Christian* hero, and a *Christian* statesman. Here lay the secret of his true greatness.

It is well observed by one of his biographers, that “when the children of years to come, hearing his great name re-echoed from every lip, shall say to their fathers: ‘what was it that raised Washington to such a height of glory,’ let them be told that it was his great talents, constantly guided and guarded by religion.”

Impressed with a due appreciation of the true character of this great and good man, the late *Earl of Buchan* said of him: “I recommend the constant remembrance of the moral and political maxims, conveyed to its citizens by the Father and Founder of the United States. It seems to me that *such maxims and such advice ought to be engraved on every FORUM OR PLACE OF COMMON ASSEMBLY among the people, and read by parents, teachers and guardians, to their children and pupils, so that true RELIGION, and VIRTUE, its inseparable attendant, may be imbibed by the rising generation to remote ages.*” Such are the sentiments cherished, and associated with his character by all the wise and the good, as far as his name is known;—and the light and influence of his noble qualities, will not only illuminate and bless the land he loved and served so well, but the remotest bounds of our wide-spread race, in the onward progress of civilization and religion.

Washington did not owe his greatness so much to any one particular trait of character of towering preëminence, as to a happy combination and adjustment of many intel-

lectual and moral qualities ; and which, by a most beautiful harmony of all his purposes and acts, whether in private or in public life, in the cabinet, or in the field, in peace or war ;—were all consecrated to the sacred cause of freedom. The *remotest* thought of self-aggrandizement he repelled as a demon intruder, and ever cultivated the most sincere and unaffected devotion to the prosperity of his country. At this shrine he laid, as a willing tribute, his *all* ;—his talents—his virtues—his prayers. In every act of his life, whether in private or public, he was guided by a calm, sound, and comprehensive judgment, and sustained by an unbending integrity ; and the height of his noble ambition was the true happiness of men.

This uniform and uncompromising devotion of every energy, thought and purpose, to the well-being of his race, to the last hour of his life, must be attributed to the all-controlling power of the religion of Christ—that religion which breaks the iron fetters of sin, and restores man, in a measure at least, to his primeval freedom and harmony with his Maker. For the Christian religion is the power of Him in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily—of Him who is the Personal *Truth* and the Personal *Life*; the true and only refuge of the soul, enslaved by the common depravity of our fallen nature.

The religious character of Washington does not indeed appear with special prominence in the way of *outward* parade or show. He regarded religion or Christian piety, as the sacred treasure of the heart—a holy living principle, that should manifest itself rather in actions than in words. It clearly appears in every step of his history, that he cherished an abiding sense of his responsibilities to his Maker, and subordinated all he did to His authority, whether of a public or private character, to the extent of his sense of right. Divine revelation was the source from which his code of ethics was drawn, to control and direct his actions. Religion, not appearance simply, was the lamp by which his feet were guided. Its dictates, he followed with silent modesty, just as the sun in the heavens, noiseless as the

sleeping dead, pursues his steady way, yet moves all nature, and perpetually new-creates the world, and decks the mountains and vales with living green. This, we think, is an apt similitude of the subject of our reflections. Without stir or commotion, filled and animated by an influence drawn from a higher world, and a character "made luminous by a Christian faith," he did not only impress and move society by what he *did*, but by what he *was*. The grandeur and moral splendor of his character, were ever adding to his active efforts, an element of silent power, which was the real and the chief cause of their efficiency. He moved and led, by the awe-inspiring and commanding dignity, which appeared in his conduct and ingenuous spirit. That humility or a modest and unobtrusive reserve, was a fixed and cherished trait in his character, is attested by the whole tenor of his life. Miss Custis, who, for twenty years, was an inmate of his family, recalling in after years, the scenes of her childhood, writes: "He was a silent, thoughtful man. He spoke little generally; never of himself. I never heard him relate a single act of his life during the war."* Mr. Elkanah Watson, an experienced traveller and close observer of men and manners, observes in relation to a visit to Mt. Vernon: "Conversing for a full hour with Washington, after all the family retired, he modestly waived all allusions to the events in which he had acted so glorious and conspicuous a part."* "I know no man," observes the late Bishop White, "who so carefully guarded against discoursing of himself, or of his acts, or of anything that pertained to him; and it has occasionally occurred to me when in his company, that, if a stranger to his person were present, he would never have known from anything said by him, that he was conscious of having distinguished himself in the eye of the world." In his religious professions, he maintained a like modest reserve, exemplifying his religious belief in his *actions*, and in a *life* so gloriously devoted to the universal well-being of society.

* Irving's Life of Washington, Vol. 4.

That the religious character of Washington was marred by the imperfections and frailties of erring humanity, is readily conceded, but these are materially modified, when account is taken of the comparatively low state of practical religion in the period in which he lived, and also the secularizing character of his trying and eventful mission. Still, however imposing his career upon the field of strife, with its fearful conflicts and brilliant victories, or in the civil councils of the nation, his *religious* character, may ever and justly be regarded his chief and crowning glory.

That Washington evinced marked religious tendencies in his early youth, his early manuscripts bear decisive testimony.

His early love of *truth* is proverbial. It is recorded of him as a mark of imperishable honor, that he was never known to lie. In disputes among the companions of his boyhood, about a question of fact, his verdict was the end of all controversy.

Among his early papers is found a transcript of an advent hymn, indicating the religious tendencies of his childhood, beginning with these lines:

"Assist me, sacred muse, to sing the morn

On which the Saviour of mankind was born."

In the thirteenth year of his age, he recorded a list of *rules* or *maxims*, for the regulation of his conduct, among which are the following:

"When you speak of God, or his attributes, let it be seriously and in reverence."

"Endeavor to keep alive in your bosom that little divine spark, called conscience."

These fundamental principles of all true piety and virtue, *conscientiousness*, and a profound *reverence* for the great Jehovah, attended him through the whole of his eventful and useful life, whether in the quiet home circle, or in its most active and busy scenes.

In his first military campaigns, when yet a young man, such was his sense of dependence upon the divine interposition, that he insisted upon the daily worship of God in

his camp, and in the temporary absence of the chaplain, would frequently read the Scriptures and offer prayer with his regiment. Such a service for the army, was, in his view, a vital interest, and in pressing its claims, with the proper authorities, he urged it, with the remark, that "the blessing and protection of heaven are at all times necessary, but especially in times of public distress and danger."

For the morality of the soldiery under his command, he was deeply solicitous, and used his best endeavors to correct any prevailing immoralities. Accordingly we find in one of his military orders, a strict and decided prohibition of profane swearing, instructing his officers to punish all such offenders with twenty-five lashes, without the formalities of a court martial. For a repetition of the offence, the punishment was ordered to be increased. His profound reverence for his Maker, and his sense of dependence upon His constant interposition, could not regard the profaning of His name with other than feelings of horror and unaffected sorrow. His own tongue never lisped that great and holy Name but with trembling awe, and he ever used his best efforts to inspire his companions in arms, with a like hallowed reverence.

Against the monster evil, "gaming," he bore an equally firm and decisive testimony, and in his military orders entered against this vice his earnest prohibition. We here give his own language upon this subject: "All officers and soldiers, are positively forbid playing at cards, or other games of chance. At this time of public distress, men may find enough to do, in the service of their God and their country, without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality. Gaming of every kind, is expressly forbidden, as being the foundation of evil, and the cause of many a brave and gallant officer's ruin. It is a vice which is productive of every possible evil; equally injurious to the morals and health of its votaries. It is the child of Avarice, the brother of Iniquity, and the father of Mischief. It has been the ruin of many worthy families, the loss of many a man's honor, and the cause of suicide. To all

those who enter the lists, it is equally fascinating. The *successful* gamester pushes his good fortune, till it is overtaken by a reverse. The *losing* gamester, in hopes of retrieving past fortunes, goes on, from bad to worse, till grown desperate, he pushes at every thing, and loses his all." Thus Washington endeavored, by every means in his power, to discountenance this, and other vices, especially profanity and drunkenness, and ever sought to inspire, in his officers and soldiers, a laudable emulation in the practice of virtue, and a faithful performance of duty in the service of their country.

Washington was a firm believer in a special overruling providence, a belief which he exemplified in all his actions. We find him constantly referring all he undertook to the *Allwise* disposer of all events, with the confidence that he would lead to such issues as would best promote the divine glory, and the good of men.

"I flatter myself," he says, "that a superintending Providence is ordering everything for the best, and that in due time all will end well. The terminations of Providence are always wise, often inscrutable; and though its decrees appear to bear hard upon us at times, they are, nevertheless, meant for gracious purposes." "Again he says: Providence has heretofore taken us up, when all other means and hope seemed to be departing from us. In this will I confide." During his Presidency, we find in his public documents many instances of his humble acknowledgment of the divine interposition. We select the following: "Although guided by our excellent constitution, in the discharge of official duties, and actuated through the whole course of our public life, solely by a wish to promote the best interests of our country; yet without the beneficial interposition of the Supreme Ruler of the universe, we could not have reached the distinguished situation which we have attained with such unprecedented rapidity. To Him, therefore, should we bow with gratitude and reverence, and endeavor to merit a continuance of his special favors. The success which hath hitherto attended our

united efforts; we owe to the gracious interposition of heaven, and to that interposition let us gratefully ascribe the praise of victory and the blessing of peace."

In tendering this homage to the great Author of all good, he was not influenced simply by a courteous regard for the feelings of a professedly Christian people, but by a sense of conscious dependence upon, and living faith in God,—a reliance, which he found his best support, in the trials through which he was called to pass. For when tossed upon the waves of an excited and oppressed people—when faction and strife were agitating many portions of the country—when wisdom and courage and even *patriotism* seemed to fail, and the whole nation recoiled from the yawning abyss that threatened to engulf it, his soul found an all-sufficient refuge in that Almighty being, to whose keeping he had piously committed the cause of his wronged and bleeding country. "*God is my hope,*" is inscribed upon all the acts of his civil and military career. To *His* favor alone, in whose hands are the destinies of nations, he looked for success, in the momentous interests he was called, by the voice of his country, to defend. With a firm confidence in the rectitude of his country's cause, he says: "We leave the event to Him who speaks the fate of nations, in humble reliance that, as His omniscient eye taketh note even of the sparrow that falleth to the ground, so he will not withdraw his countenance from a people, who humbly **ARRAY THEMSELVES UNDER HIS BANNER**, in defence of the noblest principles with which he hath adorned humanity."

But we follow Washington to a still higher eminence of moral and religious greatness. He was a worthy communicant member and honored vestryman of the Christian Church. His was not the religion of nature merely, but the religion of the Son of God. In a spirit of becoming meekness and modest reserve, he observed the ordinances and duties of a Christian profession. It is stated by Miss Custis, to whom we have already referred, that he always received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the revolution. During the vicissitudes and turmoils of the

revolutionary period, opportunities for the enjoyment of this solemnity were but rarely afforded, nor could the mind be easily composed for so sacred an approach to God, amid the din and excitement of a military campaign. Still, this service was not entirely unobserved by him, even during the progress of sanguinary hostilities. While encamped at Morristown, New Jersey, he sought and obtained permission to join in the celebration of the holy supper in the Presbyterian congregation of that place, under the pastorate of the Rev. Dr. Jones. Although a member of another branch of the Christian Church, the Protestant Episcopal, he did not only evince by this act, his regard for a divinely instituted ordinance of our holy religion, and his love to a crucified Saviour, but likewise his liberal sentiments and noble charity towards Christians of other confessions. Washington was no bigot, though ardently attached to the Church, in which he was born and reared. Upon this subject are found the following sentiments, among his public records: "It would ill become me to conceal the joy I have felt in perceiving the fraternal affection, which appears to increase every day, among the friends of genuine religion. It affords edifying prospects indeed, to see Christians of every denomination dwell together in more charity, and conduct themselves in respect to each other with a more Christian-like spirit than ever they have done in any former age, or in any nation. Being no bigot myself to any mode of worship, I am disposed to indulge the professors of Christianity in the Church with that road to heaven, which to them may seem the most direct, plainest, easiest, and the least liable to exception; and I trust the people of every denomination, who demean themselves as good citizens, will have occasion to be convinced, that I shall always strive to be a faithful and impartial patron of genuine and vital religion." Washington cherished a charity too noble and expansive to harbor for a moment, that ungracious and frosty exclusiveness which cries: "*The people of the Lord, the people of the Lord are we.*"

We must not pass unnoticed, his profound regard for, and constant attendance upon, the public worship of the sanctuary. The Rev. Mr. Massey, of whose parish Washington was an active vestryman, says: "I never knew so constant an attendant on church as Washington. And his behavior in the house of God was ever so deeply reverential, that it produced the happiest effect on my congregation, and greatly assisted me in my moralizing labors. No company ever withheld him from church. I have often been at Mt. Vernon on the Sabbath morning, when his breakfast table was filled with guests. But to him they furnished no pretext to neglect his God and losing the satisfaction of setting a good example. For, instead of staying at home, out of false complaisance to them, he used constantly to invite them to accompany him." Indeed such was his ardent attachment to the public worship of God, that during the war, when he could be possibly spared from camp, he would frequently ride ten or twelve miles to participate in the services of the sanctuary.

In his private communion with God, his example is no less illustrious. In the privacy of his closet, Washington implored that Almighty aid which was so signally vouchsafed in the achievement of the liberties of our country. It is stated by his private secretary, Mr. Lewis, that he "often found him accidentally in his library, in a kneeling posture, engaged in his devotions, with a Bible open before him." And during the time of his military service, it was his constant habit to retire for secret prayer. We have the testimony of several of his officers, "that on sudden and unexpected visits into his tent, he has more than once been found on his knees at his devotions." And not unlike his blessed Lord, often

"Cold mountains and the midnight air,
Witnessed the fervor of his prayer."

Most truly has it been said, that "the independence of our country was laid, not only in valor, patriotism, and wisdom, but in *prayer*."

We have thus given a hasty, but we believe a truthful

sketch of the religious character of the father and defender of our republic. Should our picture seem to any to be overdrawn, this is our apology : it is the picture of WASHINGTON; of Washington, who, when he had served his country with a patriotism and rectitude of purpose unparalleled in the annals of history ; of Washington, who, when he had completed his mission, and felt that the "silver cord of life was loosing, raised himself upon his bed of death, and cast a look of benignity and silent adieu on all around him, then composed his limbs, closed his eyes, and folding his arms upon his bosom, expiring, said: "FATHER OF MERCIES, TAKE ME TO THYSELF!" How truly has it been pronounced by the wisest and best men of every age, that "there never was a truly great man without religion." Men may be learned, and talented, and brave, but without religion, they are "wickedly wise, and madly brave." Napoleon was one of the bravest and most distinguished warriors the world ever beheld, and of brilliant and varied talents, but for want of genuine religion, and blinded by ambition, he mistook the *true* path to glory, and sought to perpetuate his fame and power by severing the indissoluble bond of heaven, and has left to the letter a verification of his own prediction : "Posterity will talk of Washington with reverence, as the founder of a great empire, when *my* name shall be lost in the vortex of revolutions."

Hamilton, who fought by the side of Washington and Lafayette, and stormed the British entrenchments, was brave, and talented, and accomplished, but preferring the praise of men to the praise of God, he had not the courage to say "no" to a challenge, not less infamous than barbarous. Arnold had won for himself a high military reputation, and had, on this account, committed to his trust, positions of the highest importance to the interests and safety of the contending colonies. But uninfluenced by the holy principles of religion, he sold for British gold, the cause he had so ably defended, and has loaded his name with the execrations of mankind. We repeat, then, the sentiment, that "there never was a truly great man without religion."

It is most emphatically "the one thing needful" for the full development of our powers, and the accomplishment of our true destiny. It is the source of all that is green and enduring—the chart that traces, with unerring exactness, every path of duty, and he that followeth *its* dictates "shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life." Let the religion of the Son of God abound, and sway the popular and national will, and we shall realize the beatitude of divine revelation: "Blessed is that people, whose God is the Lord." Upon this foundation our free institutions will stand firm, from age to age, until the Prince of *life*, and *truth*, and *love*, shall obtain a universal triumph, and reign King Supreme over all earth's dominions. In this our Washington trusted—in this he triumphed! By emulating his patriotism and exalted virtues, his favored countrymen, will rear to his name a more enduring memorial than a monument of marble.

Carlisle, Pa. A. H. K.

ART. IV.—A DISCOURSE BY DR. RAUCH: EVERY MAN IS THE LORD'S IN LIFE.

"For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. (Rom. 14: 8.)

The words, which I have just read, stand closely connected with those of the fourth and ninth verses of the same chapter. Paul, with whom every thing depended on faith, on our internal condition, and according to whom only those things which did not proceed from faith were sinful, warned his brethren in Rome, in view of their own errors and mistakes, against condemning their fellow Christians and judging of their personal guilt, saying by way of argument: "Who art thou, that judgest another

man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." No believer is the master of another, but all are the servants of the Lord, and to Him the judgment is given so that we may fear to see one fall, whilst the Lord holds him up. Since it is the Lord's own care, and since His alone is the power to preserve His servants, it would be arrogant to intrude ourselves, where our aid is not needed. Again, Paul says: "For to this end, Christ both died, and arose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Christ, according to the will of God, is the Lord of all that is created; He died and became a citizen of that world over which He must reign in order that His dominion may be absolute. It is, therefore, not only believers, who, being redeemed and saved through the death of Christ, willingly and joyfully acknowledge in Him their Lord and Master, but all nature and every living being in it, and all *men*, with or against their will, are the property of the Lord and will be judged by Him. Though Paul uses the words of the text particularly of the Christian, because he, having been purchased by the blood of Christ, is His who purchased him, and because he, being united to the Lord by faith and love, does not desire to be the servant of any one else, but seeks the centre of all his wishes and actions in Christ—I nevertheless feel myself justified in proving, from the former part of my text, that *every man is the Lord's whilst he lives*, and from the latter part, that *every man is the Lord's when he dies*.

PART FIRST.

I shall prove,

- 1.) That *every man whilst he lives is the Lord's*.
- 2.) That the *believer is the Lord's during life*, though in a sense entirely different from that of men in general.

I.

Every man whilst he lives is the Lord's, *without acknowledging it*. It may be, that the sinner thinks that he is the master of his own life, but he only deceives himself. From the time of his birth till he dies, there is not one moment, not one breath, which he can call entirely his own. He

is called into life, not by his choice and will, but by Him who created all things; he entered this world under certain circumstances, in a certain century, in a certain nation, in a certain family, without having been consulted; he finds himself determined in his life by an education, which he cannot give himself, but for which he depends on those that surround him; by customs and manners; by the degree of cultivation of his nation; by their religious views, their moral character, over none of which he can exercise the slightest control, whilst he is more or less determined in his whole existence by each of them. Even the country in which the Creator has cast his lot, and which by its climate, by its natural productions, by its scenery, by its situation, promotes or impedes our intellectual improvement, our comforts, our privileges as citizens—even the country, where he must live, is assigned to him by that power which reigns over our whole life, forms the chain of circumstances which influences our resolutions and actions and guides us, whilst we imagine ourselves entirely independent.

As man has not given himself his life, so he does not live by his own power, nor does he even know *how he lives*. See what an artificial constitution the body is; how wonderful the organization of the smallest part, of the eye, of the ear, of the head! How fit our limbs are for many uses, how every atom in us works and is active, solicits and feels, beats and moves, and how all is composed to act and feel, to move and live so as to produce one perfect harmony. We are fearfully and wonderfully made! The sinner cannot comprehend this wonderful work of God, much less can he support and maintain it. If one organ ceases its action, the whole organization is deranged; if the heart ceases to beat, his breath stands still. Has the sinner his life in his own power?

This wonderful body, it is true, is at the command of the soul which, present every where, holds together the whole, uses it as it may choose, devises plans, and acts through it. *But is this soul the sinner's?—Does he know what it is?—Does he know how it acts through nerves and muscles? How its will moves the arm, how the brain says to*

the foot : "move,"—"now rest again." How from a mere external excitation thoughts and meditations rise. We think, we live, we breathe, but neither in ourselves, nor through ourselves, but in and through our Lord.

Again : The soul is the power from which a great number of faculties spring forth, which, though many, are nevertheless all of them identical with each other. These faculties, however, modify and limit each other, and the manner in which this is done constitutes the peculiar talents and disposition of every man, so that, though all of us have the same faculties, the same soul, no one of us has a soul in the same manner as the other. The peculiar manner in which the various faculties modify each other in their activity, leaves a certain faculty of the soul more free and more energetic in one man than it is in another, who, having this faculty in a subordinate degree, enjoys the more free use of a different faculty which the former had not in the same degree. I need not prove now, that none of us, by his mere will, can extort from his nature such talents as Providence has denied him ; yet how much depends on our natural faculties, on our talents, on our dispositions, for our occupation in life, for the choice of a profession, for our usefulness, for our happiness. *Whence then this difference in our natural capacities?* The Lord of creation has ordered it thus. He needs all kinds of men ; He needs the learned and the ignorant, the wise and the foolish, since He, to accomplish His plan, does not look to single actions, but to their connexion and harmony. Whatever our life or our faculties be, they must serve the Lord, though we should not be aware of it.

The sinner is the Lord's without willing it. This I shall prove in the next place.

The human race consists of a vast multitude of individuals, of whom some leave this world at all seasons of the year and in all ages of life. Numbers die as children, as young men, and as men ; and there are no exceptions, no failures, in the plan of God, but even so God realizes His full and complete design. The human race is a great army of laborers, each one called in his hour and recalled ;

each one at his daily labor, with his peculiar talents and strength, and with his sickle; the one with great passions that quickly consume the lamp of his life, another destined for a longer existence, but with a flame that burns slowly and dimly; the one a mild ray of the sun that benefits his race, another like the zigzag darting of the lightning in a dark night, whose strong mind leaves a few great ideas which soon pass away again; the one as *deduction*, the other as *sum* in the account of God, but all in His account. He needs blossoms that have fallen, souls of children easily called away; ripening souls of young men; lives in the most beautiful bloom of hope—for He has ordered all of them in wisdom and proportion. Thus the whole race is a picture, in which the degrees of light and of shade produce the harmony of the whole. Who now is the man, that can review this immense whole? Who is the man that can know the part to which his life belongs?

If the sinner knew what place and what rank he occupies in this great and divine order of our world, he might perhaps direct and control his own activity. But as it is, he may commence what he may never be permitted to complete, for he may be called away sooner than he had expected; he may calculate on events with certainty, but changes that are not under his control, take place in the order by which we are surrounded, which overthrow all his calculations. Every hour and every day teaches us that every one of us is the Lord's; but we will not hear.

We all must serve the Lord—some as his slaves, without knowing His will, without desiring His favor; others as His children, initiated by divine revelation into His will, and anxious to promote it. When his unnatural brethren sold Joseph, they expected to gratify their envy and jealousy; but God made use of their arm for the promotion of His designs, and what they conceived to be a misfortune for Joseph was turned into a blessing.

The cruel Jews crucified our Redeemer, treated Him like a common criminal; effaced every trace of respect, of good will, of attachment; stigmatized His name, extinguished His life. But God used their arms, without their

knowing or willing it, to execute His plans. He whom they desired to destroy and whom they supposed to have destroyed already, was to come forth gloriously, and as the Messiah of the world. The Jews desirous of annihilating Christ's power by taking His life, laid the foundation of our divine religion which He had come upon earth to establish; for had Christ not been crucified, there would have been no atonement.

This mysterious manner, in which God uses the arm of the wicked, as well as of believers, to accomplish His plan, is very striking throughout the whole history of Christ. From scorn, His enemies had placed a crown of thorns upon His head, but just these thorns were the best symbol of those pains, which our sinful earth, the mother of thorns, had prepared for its Lord. Thus, against their will, they confess symbolically, by a crown of thorns, that Christ had to endure great griefs and pains, in order to give us life and salvation. Again: They hang Him between two sinners, as if He were the greatest among them. They hoped that they thus would wound the wounded breast of our Saviour still more at a time, when His disciples were dispersed, when Judas had betrayed Him, and Peter had denied Him. But what they would, they do not obtain; for they prepare a balm for the wounds of Christ. Faith, that had disappeared in His own disciples, shows itself in a robber. When no one could believe, that the pierced right arm of our Saviour could be strong enough to lead through the dark valley of death, when all despaired of Him who died the death of a criminal being able to open the gates of heaven, the mouth of a robber bears witness that He died to save sinners. Even the cross which they had designed as a reproach, becomes the throne on which the Lord of the world executes judgment, receiving of the two sinners the one that repented and believed into Paradise.

Truly we do not need any further proofs that every one is the Lord's whilst he lives, though he should not know it nor will it. Unless we turn our eyes to Calvary, unless we desire the living water and drink of it, we must be the

Lord's as His slaves, and not as His friends and fellow laborers in His blessed cause.

II.

The sense, however, in which Paul understood the words: "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's," is, as I have already intimated, that the believer recognizes no other master in heaven nor on earth than Christ; that he is His by *faith*. Upon faith depends his entire relation to Christ and there is no feeling, no thought, no action really good and devoted to our Lord, unless it proceeds from faith. Without a *living faith* in us, we are, therefore, not the Lord's in the sense of Paul, but in the sense of the sinner.

Faith is a gift of God; the effect of the agency of the Holy Ghost on our hearts, causing in us an entire conversion of all our faculties, of our will and of the heart; turning them from what is merely sensual, from the pleasures of the world, from mere earthly desires, to the eternal truth and to holiness, and to Christ, the source of salvation. Though this faith is a free gift of God's grace and mercy, He has ordered it thus that He will use human instrumentality in conveying this precious good to us; and among many other means, the highest and the principal one is the office of the ministry. The minister is a laborer together with God, a steward of His mysteries, a servant of Christ. His duty is to preach *Christ* alone, and nothing else. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord and ourselves your servants for Jesus sake. From the word of Christ's cross proceeds a power that needs no human assistance, but has conquered the world and is conquering it daily. Christ's life, His sufferings, His death, His resurrection, the necessity of repentance, of regeneration, of faith, must be the minister's constant theme; he must preach the word of the cross which breaketh the rock in pieces, purely and without any addition or any self-made explanations; and as the only conditions on the part of man he must represent repentance and faith, so that Christ may

appear as the only Lord, besides whom there is no other, by whom all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, and who is before all things and by whom all things consist; who alone can give life, since the Father has given Him to have life in Himself. The whole work of the minister then must be, not to make his hearers dependent on his authority, but to lead them to the Lord as the believer's only authority and master. But be ye not called Rabbi, for one is your Master, even Christ. He is a faithful minister, whose people can say with the Samaritans: "Now we believe not on account of thy saying, for we have heard Him ourselves and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

But when can we hear Christ? When is it that He speaks even yet to us? I that speak with you, am He. So He speaks to the Christian through the rays of the morning sun; so whispers the evening breeze; so murmurs the brook; so roars the hurricane; so sound the woods; so sparkles every dew drop; so twinkle the stars of night. All that is, is a picture of Him, responds to Him, points out the path to Him, bears witness of Him. He speaks to us especially through the minister, through the Church, through misfortunes, and through innumerable blessings. But nowhere does He speak to us more clearly, more distinctly, than in His ever blessed word. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me. Faith is the only condition of our connexion with the Lord, and this faith every one of us must develop and confirm by reading the word of God. As soon as we neglect this we become dependent on others, on their views, on their explanations; a third person steps in between us and our only Lord, and becomes the interpreter of Him to us. I cannot see with the eyes of another, for he cannot give me his eyes. I cannot think with the mind of another, nor can I understand what he says unless I think myself. Should I now suffer any one to give me that faith, which Christ alone can give me? To

hear Christ and understand Him does not require great acuteness of mind, nor learning, nor a high degree of cultivation. Children can understand as well as the wisest; all that is necessary on our part is to turn our hearts, our thoughts, our will to Him; to hear when He speaks to us, and so recognize His voice amid the tumult of the world, as well as in our secluded closet.

I repeat again, we become independent of every authority on earth only when we have a faith full of life and of spirit; when from our own experience we know Christ to be our Master; when we see in every authority on earth, to which we are subject, a reflex, an image of Christ's authority—in every law and command, Christ's will. Only thus do we become free. Abide in my word, and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. But be not deceived by artful speeches, nor believe every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God.

But how can we try them, unless it be by the word of God; and how can we know the word of God unless we ourselves search the Scriptures which lead us directly to Christ? As long as we need a third person to tell us what the Scriptures teach on this or that point, what Christ will have us do in the different relations of life, whether He commands or forbids what we desire; if we believe only on account of the testimony given by others; if our reverence, our obedience, our attachment, our views of Christ's great work and merit have no other basis, but that which those, who teach us, represent to us; if we have not seen for ourselves;—then in cases of doubt, we become dependent on men, like the Catholics on their priests; then our mouth is silent, our judgment ready as soon as they have spoken as they have judged. Such a faith will not suit our wants, our circumstances, our degree of intellectual culture. It is like a coat not made for us, that, when having put it on, can neither protect us from the wind nor from the storm. Like the savage who has an idol, in which he believes and which he places where he can use it; to which he runs, when he is in danger; which he removes again, when he does not need it any longer; which he leaves at

home, when he goes to his business or to his enjoyments—so is a faith, that does not rest on our own conviction, that does not attract irresistibly all our thoughts and wishes; that has not changed all our faculties and our heart; that does not restrain us from avarice and selfishness, and from being dependent on any thing on earth, or on any notions and wishes of our own; that, in short, does not make us free from self-will, and render us the servants of Christ only, to whom we must devote our whole life.

Whoever, on the other hand, has a living faith, walks during his whole life in the presence of Christ, the Sun of truth, to whom he is alive, who purifies him by His enlightening power and removes all darkness. He becomes more pure every day; but the more pure he becomes, the more humble, the more meek will he be also. Peace takes up its abode in his breast; for the coat of discontentment—his own will—drops off; he knows of something, which is better than himself, better than all that he could find or desire on earth; this he seeks and every where he is ready to perform the will of Christ, and to do all things for His honor and glory. Faith kindles a spark of life in his heart; growing in faith this spark becomes a light which shines forth in works of love. Faith is a constant intuition of our Lord and His sufferings, takes away our thoughts from mere external things, and is full of desire to see the time come, when the world will be covered with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the deep.

May the Lord lead every one of us to the fountain of faith and truth.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; forgive us our sins as we forgive those that sin against us; lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever.
Amen.

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace.

ART. V.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

We propose in this article to discuss the name, origin, authority, contents, value and use of the so called *Athanasian Symbol*, which, next to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene, or rather Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, is the most generally received Confession of faith in the Christian Church, and presents to us a succinct and clear summary of ancient Catholic theology concerning the fundamental articles of the holy Trinity and the person of Christ.*

For the convenience of the reader, we give first the symbol itself in three parallel columns, in the original Latin, the old English translation of the sixteenth century, and the revised translation prepared for the new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church in the United States.

We give the old translation precisely as it is found in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, and in the old Dutch Reformed Liturgy; but we italicize those

* The necessary information on this subject may be found in *Tillemont*, *Mémoirs pour servir à l'histoire ecclés.* (tom. VIII, 667 sqq.), *Montfaucon*, edition of the Works of Athanasius (tom. II, 719 sqq., *Diatribé de Symbolo Quicunque*); *Bingham*, *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (vol. IV, 118 sqq.); *J. G. Walch*, *Introductio in libros ecclesiasticos Luth. symbolicos* (lib. I, cap. 2 de tribus symbolis oecumenicis, p. 36 sqq.); and *Köllner*, *Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen*, Theil I, p. 58 sqq. We have consulted more particularly Walch and Köllner, who have made good use of all their predecessors. Besides there are a number of special dissertations on the Athanasian Creed, to which, however, we have unfortunately no access just now. The best of them are the following: *G. J. Voss* (a Dutch Reformed divine), *De tribus symbolis*, Amsterd. 1642; *J. H. Heidegger* (German Reformed), *De symbolo Athanasiano*, Zur. 1680; *Dan. Waterland* (Anglican), *A critical History of the Athanasian Creed*, representing the opinions of the Ancients and Moderns concerning it: with an account of the Mass, Verses, and Comments and such other particulars as are of moment for the determining of the Age, and Author, and Value of it, and the Time of its Reception in the Christian Churches, Cambridge, 1724; *Sparoni* (Roman Catholic), *De symbolo vulgo S. Athanasii*, Patav. 1761; and *Hersey* (Anglican), *History and Theology of the Three Creeds*, Lond. 1856, 2 vols. The last (from the learned editor of *Irenaeus adv. haereses*) is probably the fullest, to judge from its size and some notices I have seen in English Reviews. (Who will have mercy on the Seminary Library at Mercersburg, and furnish it with a sufficient working apparatus for the industry of poor professors?)

words which have been changed in the revised translation for reasons of taste, clearness and closer adherence to the original.

The Latin Original.

1. Quicunque vult sal-
vus esse, ante omnia opus saved: before all things saved, before all things it
est, ut tenet catholicam it is necessary, that he is necessary that he hold
fidem;

2. Quam nisi quisque
integral inviolatamque
servaverit, absque dubio
in memorem perficit.

3. Fides autem cathol-
ica haec est, ut unum De-
um in trinitate et trini-
tatem in unitate vener-
mur;

4. Neque confundentes
personas, neque substan-
tiam separantes.

5. Alia est enim per-
sona patris: alia filii: alia
spiritus sancti.

6. Sed patris et filii et
spiritus sancti una est
divinitas: aequalis gloria,
coetera majestas.

7. Qualis pater, talis
filius, talis spiritus sanc-
tus.

8. Increatus pater: in-
creatus filius: increatus
spiritus sanctus.

9. Immensus pater:
immensus filius: immen-
sus spiritus sanctus.

10. Aeternus pater:
aeternus filius: aetern-
us spiritus sanctus.

11. Et tamen non tres
aeternal; sed unus aetern-
us.

Old Translation.

1. Whosoever will be
saved: before all things saved, before all things it
is necessary, that he hold
the Catholick Faith;

2. Which Faith except
every one do keep whole
and undefiled: without
doubt he shall perish ev-
erlastingly.

3. And the Catholick
Faith is this: That we
worship one God in Trin-
ity and Trinity in Unity;

4. Neither confounding
the Persons: nor divid-
ing the substance.

5. For there is one Per-
son of the Father, another
of the Son: and another
of the Holy Ghost.

6. But the Godhead of
the Father, of the Son, and
of the Holy Ghost, is
all one, the Glory equal, all one; the glory equal,
the Majesty co-eternal.

7. Such as the Father
is, such is the Son: and
such is the Holy Ghost.

8. The Father *uncreate*,

the Son *uncreate*: and the
Holy Ghost *uncreate*.

9. The Father *incompre-
hensible*, the Son *incom-
prehensible*: and the Holy
Ghost *incomprehensible*.

10. The Father eternal,
the Son eternal: and the
Holy Ghost eternal.

11. And yet they are
not three *eternals*: but eternal, but one eternal.
one eternal.

1. Whosoever will be
the Catholic faith;

2. Which faith except
every one do keep whole
and undefiled, without
doubt he shall perish ev-
erlastingly.

3. And the Catholic
faith is this: that we wor-
ship one God in Trinity,
and Trinity in Unity;

4. Neither confounding
the persons, nor dividing
the substance.

5. For there is one per-
son of the Father, another
of the Son, and another
of the Holy Ghost.

6. But the Godhead of
the Father, of the Son, and
of the Holy Ghost, is
all one, the glory equal, all one; the glory equal,
the Majesty co-eternal.

7. Such as the Father
is, such is the Son, and
such is the Holy Ghost.

8. The Father *uncrea-*
ted, the Son *uncrea-*
ted, and the Holy Ghost *un-*
crea-
ted.

9. The Father *unlimi-*
ted, the Son *unlimi-*
ted, and the Holy Ghost *un-*
limi-
ted.

10. The Father eternal,
the Son eternal, and the
Holy Ghost eternal.

11. And yet they are
not three *eternals*: but eternal, but one eternal.
one eternal.

*The Latin Original.**Old Translation.**Revised Translation.*

12. Sicut non tres in-
creati; nec tres immensi;
not three incomprehen-
sed unus increatus et *tres*,
unus immensus.

13. Similiter omnipre-
tens pater: omnipotens
filius: omnipotens spiritu-
us sanctus.

14. Et tamen non tres
omnipotentes; sed unus
omnipotens.

15. Ita deus pater:
deus filius: deus spiritus
sanctus.

16. Et tamen non tres
dii; sed unus est Deus.

17. Ita dominus pater:
dominus filius: dominus
spiritus sanctus.

18. Et tamen non tres
domini: sed unus Dom-
inus.

19. Quia sicut singu-
latim unamquamque per-
sonam Deum ac Dominum
confiteri, christians
veritate compellimus:

20. Ita tres deos, aut
tres dominos dicere, cath-
olica religione prohibem-
ur.

21. Pater a nullo est
factus, nec creatus; nec
genitus.

22. Filius a patre solo
est: non factus; nec crea-
tus; sed genitus.

23. Spiritus sanctus a
patre et filio: non factus;
nec creatus; nec genitus,
sed procedens.

12. As also there are
uncreated, nor three un-
limited; but one uncrea-
but one uncreated, and one, and one unlimited.
one incomprehensible.

13. So likewise the
Father is Almighty, the Father is almighty, the
Son Almighty: and the Son almighty, and the
Holy Ghost Almighty.

14. And yet *they are not*
three *Almighty*: but one al-
mighty.

15. So the Father is
God, the Son is God: and
the Holy Ghost is God.

16. And yet they are
not three Gods, but one God.

17. So likewise the
Father is Lord, the Son Father is Lord, the Son
Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord, and the Holy Ghost
Lord.

18. And yet not three
Lords, but one Lord.

19. For like as we are
compelled by the Chris-
tian verity: to ac-
knowledge every Person
edge each person, by him-
self to be God and self to be God and Lord;
Lord;

20. So are we forbid-
den by the Catholick Reli-
gion: to say, There be
three Gods, or three Gods or three Lords.

21. The Father is made
of none: neither created,
nor begotten.

22. The Son is of the
Father alone: not made, Father alone, not made,
nor created, but begot- nor created, but begotten.

23. The Holy Ghost is
of the Father and of the
Son: neither made, nor Son, neither made, nor
created, nor begotten, but created, nor begotten, but
proceeding.

<i>Original Latin.</i>	<i>Old Translation.</i>	<i>Revised Translation.</i>
24. Unus ergo pater.	24. So there is one	24. So there is one
non tres patres: unus si-	Father, not three Fathers; Father, not three Fathers;	Father, not three Fathers;
tis, non tres filii: unus one Son, not three Sons: one Son, not three Sons;	one Holy Ghost, not three	one Holy Ghost, not three
spiritus sanctus, non tres	one Holy Ghost, not three	one Holy Ghost, not three
spiritus sancti.	Holy Ghosts.	Holy Ghosts.
25. Et in haec trini-	25. And in this Trinity	25. And in this Trinity
tate nihil prius; aut pos-	none is before, or after other:	there is no before, nor
terius: nihil maior; aut none is greater, or less after; no greater nor less	greater, or less after;	than another;
minus.		
26. Sed totae tres per-	26. But the whole three	26. But the whole three
sonae coæternae sibi Persons are co-eternal persons are co-eternal,		
sunt et coæquales.	together: and co-equal.	and co-equal.
27. Ita, ut per omnia,	27. So that in all things,	27. So that in all things,
sicut jam supra dictum as aforesaid: the Unity in	as already said: the Uni-	Trinity, and the Trinity in Trinity, and the
est, et trinitas in unitate: et unitas in trinitate ve-	in Unity, is to be worshipped.	Trinity in Unity is to be worshipped.
nnerenda sit.		
28. Qui vult ergo salvus	28. He therefore that	28. He therefore that
esse, ita de trinitate sen-	will be saved: must thus	will be saved, must thus
tat.	think of the Trinity.	think of the Trinity.
29. Sed necessarium est	29. Furthermore it is	29. Furthermore, it is
ad aeternam salutem, ut necessary to everlasting necessary to everlasting		
incarnationem queque salvation: that he also salvation, that we also		
domini nostri Iesu Christi believe rightly the Incar-		
fidelitudo credat.	believe truly the Incarna-	tion of our Lord Jesus
	tion of our Lord Jesus	Christ.
30. Est ergo fides rec-	30. For the right Faith	30. For the right faith
ta, ut credamus et confi-	is, that we believe and is, that we believe and	is, that we believe and
teamur, quod dominus confess: that our Lord confess, that our Lord	teamur, quod dominus confess: that our Lord confess, that our Lord	teamur, quod dominus confess: that our Lord confess, that our Lord
noster Jesus Christus Jesus Christ, the Son of Jesus Christ, the Son of	Jesus Christ, the Son of Jesus Christ, the Son of	Jesus Christ, the Son of Jesus Christ, the Son of
Dei filius, deus et homo God, is God and Man;	Dei filius, deus et homo God, is God and Man;	Dei filius, deus et homo God, is God and man;
est.		
31. Deus ex substantia	31. God, of the Sub-	31. God, of the sub-
patriæ, ante secula geni-	stance of the Father, he-	stance of the Father, be-
stus, et homo ex substanc-	stance of the Father, he-	gotten before the world: gotten before the world;
tia matris, in osculo na-	stance of the Father, he-	and Man, of the Substance and man, of the substance
tus.	stance of his Mother, born in of his mother, born in	of his Mother, born in of his mother, born in
	the world;	the world;
32. Perfectus deus: per-	32. Perfect God and	32. Perfect God, and
fectus homo, ex anima	perfect Man: of a reason-	perfect Man, of a reason-
rationali et humana car-	able soul and human flesh able soul and human	able soul and human
ne subsistens.	subsisting;	flesh subsisting;
33. Aequalis patri secun-	33. Equal to the Fath-	33. Equal to the Fath-
dum divinitatem: mi-	er, as touching his God-	er, according to His God-
nior patri secundum hu-	head: and inferior to the head, and inferior to the	head: and inferior to the head, and inferior to the
manitatem.	Father as touching his Father, according to His	Father as touching his Father, according to His
	Manhood.	Manhood.

*Original Latin.**Old Translation.**Revised Translation.*

34. Qui heest Deus sit et homo; non duo tamen, be God and Man; yet he be God and man, yet he sed unus est Christus. is not two, but one Christ; is not two, but one Christ;

35. Unus autem, non conversione divinitatis in version of the Godhead into carnem; sed assumptione into flesh: but by *taking* flesh, but by assumption humanitatis in Deum. of the Manhood into God; of the manhood into God;

36. Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae; not by confusion of Substance; but by unity of Person.

37. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est hic soul and flesh is one home; ita deus et homo man: so God and Man is man; so God and man is unus est Christus. one Christ;

38. Qui passus est pro nostra salute: descendit our salvation: descended ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortua. into hell: rose again the third day from the dead.

39. Ascendit ad coelos: sedet ad dexteram dei patris omnipotentis. 39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the Father right hand of God the God Almighty:

40. Inde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos. 40. From whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

41. Ad cuius adventum conuenient homines resurgere all men shall rise again habent cum corporibus suis: 41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;

42. Et reddituri sunt de factis propriis ratione. 42. And shall give account for their own works.

43. Et qui bona egunt, ibunt in vitam eternam; qui vero mala, in ignem aeternum. 43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

44. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quis crediderit, salvus esse non poterit. 44. This is the Catholic Faith: which except a man believe faithfully, firmly, truly and firmly, he cannot be saved.

NAME.

The third ecumenical or universal Creed of the Christian Church bears a double name.

It is sometimes called the *Symbolum Quicunque* or simply the *Quicunque*,* from its beginning in Latin : *Quicunque vult salvus esse, Whosoever will be saved.*

But more generally it goes by the name of the *Athanasian Creed*,† from the supposed authorship of St. Athanasius, or its agreement with his theology. This makes it necessary to say a few words on this distinguished father.

Athanasius was the leading champion of the orthodox doctrine on the divinity of Christ and the holy Trinity in the Nicene age. He was born towards the close of the third century at Alexandria, the capital of Egypt. His youth fell in that remarkable transition period of the Christian Church from oppression and persecution to victory and power in the Roman Empire. He made his first appearance on the stage of history at the first general Council, convened by Constantine the Great at the city of Nice in 325, for the purpose of settling the Arian controversy, i. e., the question whether Christ is strictly divine or not ; whether he is the eternal Son of the Father and equal in essence with him (*ομοονομος*), or whether he be a creature of God, though made before the world, and consequently of a different substance (*ετεροονομος*). Although at that time merely an archdeacon and secretary of bishop Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius occupied by his talents and zeal the most prominent place in that Council among the defenders of the strict divinity of the Saviour against the Arians who denied it, and materially helped the triumph of the orthodox view, as embodied and symbolically fixed in what has since been called the Nicene Creed. Soon afterwards he became the successor of Alex-

* First by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, about A. D. 852, who calls it also "Sermonem Athanasii de fide, cuius initium est: quicunque vult salvus esse."

† It first bears this name in the oldest complete manuscript copy extant, called Cod. Usserius secundus, ascribed to the year 708. It has the title : "Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini."

ander in the first episcopal see of Egypt. From this time on, during the long continued Arian and Semi-Arian conflicts which soon followed the temporary settlement at the Nicene Synod, he stood forth as the acknowledged leader of the Nicene or orthodox party, beloved by his friends, feared by his enemies, admired and respected by all. He devoted his whole life, with unwavering consistency in prosperity and adversity, at home and in exile, to the defence of the true Godhead of Christ. This was the one great idea of his mind, the ruling passion of his heart, the all-absorbing object of his will. For this he suffered five times deposition and exile. For this he was willing at any time to shed his blood. He was a man of one idea, indeed, but an idea which he firmly and justly believed to be absolutely fundamental to the Christian system and the salvation of the world. To the violence and intrigues of the imperial court, to the passions and fanaticism of heretical parties, he uniformly opposed the overwhelming force of a commanding genius and a holy life. Although he died several years before the final settlement of this great controversy by the second oecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, the triumph of the orthodox view must, under God, be mainly attributed to him. Athanasius was unquestionably the greatest man of his age, and one of the purest and noblest in the history of the Church. He is justly called *the Great and the Father of Orthodoxy*.

Even Gibbon, with all his strong prejudices, has pronounced an eloquent eulogy on him in the XXI chapter of his celebrated work. "We have seldom," says this deistic historian, "an opportunity of observing, either in active or speculative life, what effect may be produced, or what obstacles may be surmounted, by the force of a single mind, when it is inflexibly applied to the pursuit of a single object. The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. Educated in the family of Alexander, he had vigorously opposed the early progress of the Arian heresy: he exercised the important functions of secretary

under the aged prelate; and the fathers of the Nicene council beheld with surprise and respect the rising virtues of the young deacon. In a time of public danger, the dull claims of age and rank are sometimes superseded; and within five months after his return from Nice, the deacon Athanasius was seated on the archiepiscopal throne of Egypt. He filled that eminent station above forty-six years, and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was Athanasius expelled from his throne; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive; and almost every province of the Roman empire was successively witness to his merits and his sufferings in the cause of the Homoousion, which he considered as the sole pleasure and business, as the duty and as the glory of his life. Amidst the storms of persecution, the archbishop of Alexandria was patient of labor, jealous of fame, careless of safety; and although his mind was tainted by the contagion of fanaticism, Athanasius displayed a superiority of character and abilities, which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy. . . . The archbishop of Alexandria was capable of distinguishing how far he might boldly command, and where he must dexterously insinuate; how long he might contend with power, and when he must withdraw from persecution; and while he directed the thunders of the Church against heresy, he could assume, in the bosom of his own party, the flexible and indulgent temper of a prudent leader. The election of Athanasius has not escaped the reproach of irregularity and precipitation; but the propriety of his behavior conciliated the affections both of the clergy and of the people. The Alexandrians were impatient to rise in arms for the defence of an eloquent and liberal pastor. In his distress he always derived support, or at least consolation, from the faithful attachment of his parochial clergy; and the hundred bishops of Egypt adhered, with unshaken zeal, to the cause of Athanasius. In the modest equipage which pride and policy would affect, he frequently performed the episcopal visitation of his

provinces, from the mouth of the Nile to the confines of Aethiopia; familiarly conversing with the meanest of the populace, and humbly saluting the saints and hermits of the desert. Nor was it only in ecclesiastical assemblies, among men whose education and manners were similar to his own, that Athanasius displayed the ascendancy of his genius. He appeared with easy and respectful firmness in the courts of princes; and in the various turns of his prosperous and adverse fortune he never lost the confidence of his friends, or the esteem of his enemies."

ORIGIN.

But is Athanasius really the author of the creed which has so long been identified with his distinguished name? This question must now be decided in the negative, as much so as the question of the strictly apostolic origin of the first ecumenical creed. And yet in both cases there is a certain propriety in the name, if we leave out of view the form of words and actual composition, and look merely to the contents and their essential agreement with the faith and teaching of the supposed authors.

It is probable that the designation was first given to this document with the view simply to characterize its doctrinal tone, as the expression of the faith of Athanasius,* (hence the oldest titles: "*fides Athanasii*," "*fides Catholica*"), and not to indicate the literal authorship and thus to clothe it at once with the authority of a great and universally revered name. At all events there is no room here for a wilful pious fraud. An innocent mistake explains the matter sufficiently, especially in an uncritical age. The real author of this trinitarian creed being unknown, it was naturally traced, first by way of mere conjecture and supposition, to the great representative of the received doctrine of the holy Trinity, whose very name was identified with orthodoxy as regards this particular article. For the terms

* This was the view of Weber, *Lib. symb.* p. 17: *Ab Athanasio nomen habet, non quod ab illo viro vere scriptum sit, sed quod cum sententia Athanasii maxime conveniat.* See Kölner, *l. c.*, p. 65.

Athanasian, homoousian, Nicene, orthodox, are used syonymously in the history of the Arian and Semi-Arian controversies of the Nicene Age. This conjecture was, however, by no means generally received at first. Several manuscript copies of the Creed give either no name at all,* or ascribe it to a different author, Anastasius.† We find doubts yet as late as the twelfth century.‡ But after this time the belief in the Athanasian origin became general and prevailed, without examination, down towards the middle of the seventeenth century,|| when Gerhard John Vossius, a Dutch Reformed divine, made it the subject of a critical dissertation in 1642, and turned the current. Since that time it is almost universally given up by historians and critics, not only by Protestants, as Vossius, Heidegger, Usser, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, Cave, Bingham, Waterland, Buddeus, Walch, Schroechk, Neander, Gieseeler, Köllner, but also by Roman Catholics, as Petavius, Quesnel, Pagi, Tillemont, Montfaucon, Muratori, Natalis Alexander, Du Pin, Speroni, and even pope Benedict XIV.

The arguments against the authorship of Athanasius are so strong indeed that it is impossible to resist them. Köllner enumerates nineteen. We will mention only the principal ones.

1.) Athanasius himself never mentions this symbol in any of his works, and had no occasion to compose it, being satisfied with the Nicene creed and bent upon explaining and maintaining it against every opposition. Yea, he says distinctly, in one passage,§ that the Nicene creed was suffi-

* Codd. Uss. 1, Treves, Ambrosian., Colb. 1, Regius, Benet C. 2, Benet C. 3. Cotton 8, Cambridge, St. Jam. 2. Comp. Waterland, p. 24, and Köllner, p. 72.

† So the German MSS. Waterland, however, supposes that this is a mere orthographical mistake for Athanasius.

‡ In 1138 by Otho in the words: *Athanasius a quibusdam dicitur edidisse;* and in 1190 by Beileth in the words: *Quod ab Athan. P. A. compositum est:* *plerique cum Anathasium fuisse falso arbitrantur.* See Montfaucon Distr. etc. in Opp. Athan. II, 722.

|| The last distinguished defendants were the Roman Catholic divines, Baronius (Annal. ad ann. 840 num. 11), Bona and Bellarminus.

§ Ep. ad Antioch. tom. I. p. 772. Comp. Köllner p. 72, and Walch, l. c. p. 149.

[April,

cient, and that no other profession of faith should be issued.

2.) It is not found in any of the older manuscripts of the works of Athanasius, and those which have it, either deny it to him or express a doubt as to his authorship.*

3.) It is not mentioned by any cotemporary of Athanasius, nor his biographers and eulogists,† nor by any of the fathers and councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, although during the all absorbing trinitarian and christological controversies, they had frequent occasion to allude to this important document if it existed, and although they frequently appeal to the authority of Athanasius and mention his other writings. Under these circumstances the silence is absolutely conclusive against the very existence of the Athanasian creed, unless we choose to suppose that it was concealed for nearly three hundred years, and then suddenly turned up in the sixth or seventh century, which would imply an almost miraculous preservation.

4.) The symbol under consideration was evidently first written in the Latin language and seems to have been unknown among the Greeks before the eleventh century. There are but few Greek manuscript copies extant,‡ and they differ so much, that they unmistakably point to several and rather unskilled translators. Now it is very improbable that Athanasius, even if he knew Latin sufficient-

* Sculpetus, in *Medulla Patrum*, part. 2. de Athan. c. 40, says: *In nullo codice extat quos ego quidem vidi, inter Athanasi opera.* In uno legitur; sed auctoris nomine suppresso. Speroni, l. c. (quoted by Kölner p. 72) says more distinctly: *At multi codd. MSS. sunt, qui non modo non habent hoc symbolum, quamquam opera omnia comprehendant Athanasi; sed negant omnino his verbis: Symbolum vulgo Athanasi, Symbolum quod nou est Athanasi, Symbolum perperam Athanasi tributum.*

† The only allusion which former writers have been able to find, is a passage of Gregorius Nazianensis, in his laudatory oration on Athanasius, where he speaks of him as having confessed (*φαύλωνες*) the Godhead and essence of the three (*τριηγώνος θεόντα τε εστιν*). But it is now universally conceded that this does not refer to a particular creed at all, or if so, to one of the two other confessions still extant, in which he likewise speaks of the Godhead and essence of the three Persons.

‡ Four according to Montfaucon, eight according to Waterland. The former asserts that none of them was written before 1300. "Nullum vidimus Graecum huius symboli codicem, qui trecentorum sit annorum; nec antiquum alium a quopiam visum fuisse novimus." *Districe de Symb. Quieunque in Opp. Athan. II*, p. 727.

ly to write so well, should have composed such an important document in a foreign tongue, instead of his own vernacular Greek, which was then the prevailing language of the Church and used even by the early Western fathers, as Clement of Rome, Irenaeus of Gaul, and Hippolytus of Rome. (The report, that Athanasius composed it during his exile at Treves, about 340, and submitted it to pope Julius of Rome, in proof of his orthodoxy against the charge of heresy, or that he wrote it at Rome, and that it remained concealed there for a long time, is utterly worthless, since it is not even mentioned before the twelfth century (1130), and is evidently one of the many falsehoods which were manufactured in the middle age for the supposed benefit of the absolute papacy. No Roman divine of any weight, since Baronius and Bellarmin, has dared to give it credit.)

5.) To these external arguments, though mostly of a negative and indirect character, must be added the internal evidence of the Creed itself, which alone is conclusive. For while it omits the favorite expressions of Athanasius, especially the term *homocessio*, on which the whole Arian controversy turned, it contains the later Latin addition *et filio*, concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost,* which the Greek Church never admitted, and generally goes beyond the Athanasian theology and the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, not only in the Trinity, but still more in the Christology, evidently presupposing the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, which were not concluded till the council of Chalcedon in 451, about eighty years after the death of Athanasius. We fully admit that he had already substantially the same faith, but by no means the same logical consciousness or scientific comprehension of it, as is here implied.† He nowhere in his writings speaks

* V. 23: *Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.*

† This is honestly admitted even by his learned Benedictine editor, Montfaucon, l. c. p. 723: *Licet enim una eademque semper fuerit ea de re Ecclesiae doctrina, nondum tamen haec formulæ in Ecclesia receptæ vel in confessæ erant. He asserts an entire difference of style between the *Symbolum Quicunque* and the genuine Athanasian writings.*

so clearly and definitely of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, and as to the two natures of Christ, he even uses expressions which in a *later* age would have been justly liable to a Monophysite or Eutychian construction,* while the Creed which bears his name, is as clear and distinct on this subject as the council of Chalcedon.

But the more difficult question now arises, who is the real author of this remarkable production? Here is a wide field for critical conjecture. Quite a number of persons have been proposed with more or less plausibility, but without sufficient evidence in any case, viz.: Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, about 484,† Vincentius Lirinensis, about 484,‡ Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, about 560,|| Hilarius Arelatensis, about 429,§ Hilarius Pictaviensis, about 854, Eusebius Vercellensis, 354, pope Anastasius I, 398. Athanasius, bishop of Speier, in Germany, 642,. Others assign the symbol indefinitely to some Gallican divine,¶ or to Spanish origin,° others less indefinitely

* Especially in one passage De incarnatione Verbi (Opp. ed. Montfaucon, II, 1) where he says: "We profess also that there is one Son of God who is God according to the Spirit, and Son of man according to the flesh; not two natures, the one to be worshipped, the other not, but one nature of the God Logos which became incarnate (*αλλε μαν φύσιν τον θεόν λόγον σαρκωμένην*) and is to be worshipped together with his flesh in one worship." This, and similar passages of Hilary and even pope Julius I, have given great trouble to such Roman divines who deny all development and change in the doctrine of their Church. Comp. Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte I, 2, 488 p. 123 seq.

[†]By Paschas. Quesnel, diss. xiv. ad Oper. Leonis M. p. 384 sqq., Natalis Alexander, Pagi, Dupin. So also Neander, in his posthumous work on Doctrine History edited by Jacobi, Vol I, p. 323, where he says that this Symbol was made most probably in the fifth century in the North African Church by Vigilius Tapensis, during the renewal of the Arian controversy under the rule of the Vandals. The principal argument for this view is taken from the similarity of thought and style and the occurrence of the passage : " Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus S. ; Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus Spiritus S. ; Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus S." Vigilius is supposed by some to be the author of the twelve books De Trinitate which go under the name of Athanasius, and also of the Disputation between Athanasius, Arius and Probus; but this is rather uncertain.

[†] By Jos. Anthelmi, on the ground especially of some resemblance between the Symbl. Athan. and the Communitorum of Vincentius.

By Muratori.

By Waterland.

1 So Pithœus, Vessia, Montfaucon, Kölner.

• Glassloc.

to a Latin father;* while still others leave the authorship entirely doubtful.†

This very diversity of opinion shows that we do not know the real author. Even the arguments in favor of the claims of Vigilius Tapsensis, which are the most plausible, prove only the possibility, not even the probability, of his authorship.

The case seems to us almost parallel with that of the Apostles' Creed, and in a less degree also with that of the Nicene Creed, and we are surprised that none of the numerous writers on this subject, as far as we can see, has directed attention to this fact.

The Apostles' Creed, it is now universally admitted, can not be traced to the Apostles,‡ nor to any particular author, age or country, but must be regarded as the production of the ancient Catholic Church. Its living root and substance goes back, indeed, to the Apostolic age, to the baptismal formula (Matth. 28: 19) and the confession of Peter (Matth. 16: 16). But its present form is the result of a gradual and imperceptible growth which can be traced through the various and yet essentially identical rules of faith or baptismal creeds of the second and third centuries, as found in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and which attained its maturity towards the end of the third, or at all events at the beginning of the fourth century, before the Council of Nice in 325, the Nicene Creed being an expansion and more explicit definition of the Apostles' Creed.||

* Pearson and Fabricius.

† Patavinus, Taylor, Cudworth, Tillament, Buddeus, Welch.

‡ As was done first by the presbyter, Rufinus of Aquileia, about 400, in his Exposition of the Creed. He represents it as the joint production of the twelve Apostles before leaving Jerusalem, each contributing one article, and thus explains the word *συνθήσεις*, taking it in the sense of *synthesis*, *collatio*, while in fact it means sign, distinctive mark, form of confession. This tradition became soon current in the fifth century and obtained to the fifteenth, when Laurentius Valla and subsequently Erasmus undermined it.

|| On the particulars of the origin, history and character of the Apostles' Creed, we must refer to the following treatises: *Eugenius*, Expositio in Symbolum Apostolicum (in the works of Hieronymus). *Augustinus*, De Fide et Symb. Hagiographar. De Symb. Apost. *Gied. Voetius*, De Symb. Apost. *J. Pearson*, Exposition of the Creed. *P. King*, The History of the Apostles' Creed. *Kessler*, Symbolik aller Christi Confessiones, vol. I, p. 6 sqq. *J. W. Nevin*, The Apostles' Creed, three articles in the Mercersburg Review for 1849.

As to the origin of the Nicene or rather Nicoseno-Constantinopolitan Creed, we can speak more definitely. We know the precise time of its composition: it was formed at Nice in 325 and completed at Constantinople in 381, with the exception of the clause *filioque*, which is a later addition of the Latin Church and became a bone of contention between it and the Greek Church. We can go further and say that the formula proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea at Nice, was, in all probability, made the basis of the first draft. But this was shaped into a far more definite, anti-Arian character, especially by the insertion of the famous predicate of the Son: *homousios, or consubstantialis, coequal, of one substance* with the Father, which Eusebius wished to avoid in the interest of peace. Half a century afterwards the Constantinopolitan Council made several omissions and an important addition concerning the Holy Ghost, called forth by the intervening doctrinal controversies. Thus even this symbol, though less catholic than the Apostolium, can by no means be traced to any individual author, but must be regarded as the joint product of the Nicene age or of the first two ecumenical Synods.*

We may illustrate the formation of the Nicene Creed by alluding to the official reports and acts of our ecclesiastical and political assemblies. Important matters are generally first referred to a committee of three, five or more persons, with a responsible chairman. He draws up a report, submits it to the other members of the committee for approval, rejection, or revision, which may result in a radical reconstruction. Then it is brought up before the general body for action, and there it again undergoes, in many cases, a variety of changes before it is finally adopted. At all events, if adopted, it ceases to be the work of an individual, or even a committee and becomes the property of the whole body, clothed with all the weight and authority which it may possess.

* The origin and history of the Nicene Creed is more fully discussed by Vossius, Usser, Bingham, Heidegger, Walther, Bauer, Bianchini, Guleer, Welch, Kölner, and others. See the literature in Welsh, *Introductio in Libros Symbolicos*, p. 121 sqq., and in Kölner, *Symbolik*, etc., I, p. 6 and p. 23.

Now, as the Apostles' Creed is the work of the ante-Nicene age, and the Nicene Creed the work of the Nicene age, so the Athanasian Creed may justly be called the work of the post-Nicene age, or of the Catholic Church from the close of the fourth to the close of the fifth century. Its germ may indeed be traced back to Athanasius, and so far it may still go under his name; single words and passages may be found in the writings attributed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and others. But its final shape and form evidently presupposes the Arian, Semiarrian, Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, and the first four general councils, none of which alludes to it, although such allusion, if the work existed already, could not possibly be avoided. Its composition, therefore, must be placed after the year 451, when the Council of Chalcedon settled that very doctrine of the two natures in Christ's person, which is so distinctly expressed in this Creed. On the other hand it cannot be carried down to a much later period, since it contains no allusion yet to the Monothelite controversy concerning the two wills of Christ, which commenced in 633 and was finally settled by the sixth general Council in 680. We assign it, therefore, to the second half of the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth.* It must have proceeded, moreover, from the Latin Church, for reasons already stated, and more particularly from the school of St. Augustine, who insisted more clearly and emphatically than any of the preceding fathers, on the strict equality and coördination of the Son and *Holy Ghost* with the Father, and represented the creation, redemption and sanctification as the work of the one undivided Divinity. The place of composition can not be decided with any degree of certainty. It may have been written in North Africa, the country of Augustine, or in Spain, but more probably in Gaul, where it first spread and found favor.

* We can not agree with Dr. Gieseier (*Kirchengeschichte II.* §12, p. 100, note 7, fourth ed.) who thinks that the *Athanasium* can not be traced beyond the eighth century, and regards all the earlier allusions to it uncertain. He inclines to the opinion that it originated in Spain, where the conflict between the Athanasian and the Arian party continued longer than in any other country. But the majority of critics assign it to an earlier period and to Gaul.

This view of the case is sustained by the manner in which the Athanasian Creed comes to notice. It appears not in full at once, but gradually as it were. We meet first single words and passages of it in several writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, as Vigilius Tapsensis, of Africa (484),* Avitus Viennensis, of Gaul (500),† Caesarius Arelatensis, of Gaul (520),‡ Venantius Fortunatus, of Gaul (580),|| and also in acts of Councils, especially the Councils of Toledo in Spain, of the seventh century.§ Then we have it in full in a number of Latin manuscript copies, the precise age of which, however, it is impossible, in most cases, to fix with any degree of certainty. The oldest, which is now lost, is assigned to the year 600,¶ the next to 660,° the third to 700,** the fourth to 703,†† etc. The last men-

* In the passage already quoted, p. 244.

† Who uses the terms *nec factus, nec creatus, nec genitus*, of the Holy Ghost.

‡ In a sermon which found its way among those of St. Augustine (*Opera*, tom. v. p. 399,) but which the Benedictine editors of Augustine, also Oudin, Waterland, and Kölner, (l. c. p. 60) ascribe to Caesarius of Arles (508–543). There occurs the first clear allusion which sounds like a direct quotation from the Athanasianum, as Gieseler admits, who, however, doubts the authorship of Caesarius. It reads thus, (we italicize the words corresponding to the symbol): “Rogo et admoneo vos, Fratres carissimi, ut Quicunque vult salvis esse, Fides restans et Catholicismus discat, formiter tenuat inviolatamque conservet. —Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus: sed tamen non trius Dii, sed unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus. Attamen credit unusquisque fidem, quod Filius aequalis est Patri secundum divisionem, et minor est Filius secundum humanitatem carnis, quam de nostro assumptus.”

|| Who is supposed by Muratori, Waterland, and Kölner to be the author of the *Expositio fidel catholicae*, which assumes already the general reception of the Symbolum Quicunque, and defends the *filiusque*. For this reason Gieseler denies said Expositio to Fortunatus, but without being able to assign it to any other source.

¶ Conc. Tolet. IV. (anno 633) cap. I. Conc. Tolet. VI. (a. 638) c. I. Conc. Tolet. XI. (a. 675) praeſ., and C. T. XIV. (a. 694) c. 8. The close relation between these councils and several passages of the Athanasianum is undeniable, and the question is merely, whether the councils quote from the Symbol without naming it, as most writers suppose, or whether the Symbol borrowed from the councils, as Gieseler (l. c. p. 110) thinks.

** It is called Codex Usser. I. Archibishop Usser or Usher saw it in a *Psalterium Latino-Gallicum* of the Bibliotheca Cottoniana, and assigned it “tum ex antiquo picturæ generæ, tum ex literarum forma grandisca” to the age of Gregory I (590–604). But it has since disappeared.

†† The manuscript of Treves on the borders of Gaul and Germany.

** Ms. Ambros. in the Ambroidian library at Milan.

†† Cod. Usser. II. (Cotton. I.) in a copy of the Gallican Psalter of King Aethelstan. Usser says of it, De symb. p. 8: “Psalterium illud anno aereæ nostræ Christianæ 703, longe ante Aethelstani regnantis tempora, ex regnante. Kalendario in libri little subjunctis scriptum fuisse deprehendi.” Wat-

tioned is the first copy which ascribes the symbol to Athanasius, though in a somewhat equivocal way, by calling it the "*Faith of Saint Athanasius.*"

If this view be correct, the *Symbolum Quicunque* is less individual and more catholic in its very origin, than any other confession of Christendom, with the only exception of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. This fact does not weaken, but rather strengthens its authority as a confession of faith. If Athanasius were an inspired apostle, then the case would be very different. But as all the teachers of the Church, since the apostles, are fallible men, their writings carry no more weight and authority with them than their merits justify, and the Church has given them by its own consent. The validity and value of the Athanasian creed can in no case be made to rest on the authority of any individual, however great and good, and the more it is separated from individual authorship, the better for its catholic and churchly character.

RECEPTION AND AUTHORITY.

As soon as the Athanasian Symbol clearly appears in history, we find it in high esteem and quietly assuming its position among the authoritative doctrinal and liturgical standards of the *Latin Church*, first in France about 550, then in Spain 630, in Germany 800, in England 880, in Italy 880, in Rome 930.* The Roman Church in this point did not lead but follow public opinion. The Creed was frequently commented upon,† embodied in copies of the Psalter and Breviary, ordered to be committed to memory by the priests, and introduced into the weekly or even daily worship.‡

orland (l. c. p. 51, as quoted by Kölner p. 62) remarks: "The Psalter, where-in this Creed is, is the Gallican Psalter, not the Roman; the title is, *Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini*: the oldest monument of any we have extant (—Cod. Urs. I. being lost—) ascribing this Creed to Athanasius."

* See Waterland l. c. and Kölner p. 85.

† By Venantius Fortunatus, Hinemar, Drusus of Würzburg, Peter Abælard, St. Hildegard, Alexander ab Hales, John Wycliffe, and others.

‡ Hatto, bishop of Basel, A. D., 820: "Ut Fides S. Athanasii a sacerdotibus discatur et ex corde, die Dominionis, ad Primam recitetur." A more ex-

In the Greek Church the Athanasian Creed, when it first became known, after the tenth century, met with opposition, especially on account of the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Spirit from the Son, as well as from the Father.^{||} Subsequently it was likewise introduced, but less extensively than in the Latin Church, and with some alterations, and with the omission of the *τὸν ἐκ τοῦ νεόν, et filio*, (corresponding to the *filioque* in the Latin versions of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Symbol).[§]

From the Latin Church the Athanasian Creed, together with the other two ecumenical Creeds, passed over into the orthodox Protestant Churches, and was either separately and expressly acknowledged, or substantially incorporated into their doctrinal or devotional standards.

The Lutheran Church received it among its symbolical books. Luther appreciated it highly and was disposed to regard it as the most important and glorious production since the days of the Apostles.[†] The "Augsburg Confession" substantially repeats its doctrine of the Trinity, and of Christ's person, without naming it.[‡] The "Form of Concord" distinctly recognizes it as scriptural, true and authoritative.[§] Hence it is found in all the editions of the

pliicit testimony for the liturgical use of this Creed in the French and English Churches is furnished by Abbo of Fleury about 997 (quoted by Kölner, p. 66). Of later usage Bona (Tract. de divina Psalmodia, p. 863) says: "Illiud symbolum olim, teste Honorio, quotidie est decantatum, jam vero diebus Dominicis in totius coetus frequentia recitatur, ut sanctae fidei confessio ea die apertius celebretur."

^{||} Some Greek divines denied that Athanasius ever wrote it; others maintained that he was drunk when he composed it; still others that the Latins corrupted his Creed by the insertion of the *et filio*. The last is also asserted in the Confessio Metropopanis Critopuli, comp. Kimmel's Monuments Fidei Ecclesiæ Orient., P. II. p. 23.

[‡] Bingham: *Presenter Gracci eo utuntur nonnullis additamentis aucto et aliquantum mutato.*

[†] "Es ist also gefasset," he says, "dass ich nicht weiss, ob seit der Apostel Zeit in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres geschrieben sei." Comp. Luth. Opp. Hal. VI. 2818 sqq.

[§] Art. I and Art III (p. 9 and 10 ed. Hase).

[‡] Epit. p. 571, and more fully in the *Solidus Declar.* p. 632 (ed. Hase): "Amplectimur etiam tria illa Catholica et generalia summae auctoritatis Symbola, Apostolicum, videlicet, Nicenum, et *Athenasii*. Haec enim agnoscimus eas breves quidem, sed easdem maxime pias, atque in verbo Dei solide fundatae, praelatas Confessiones fidei, quibus omnes haereses, quae hanc temporis Ecclesias Christi postularunt, perspicue et solide refutantur."

"Book of Concord" as the third symbol of the Lutheran Confession.

The Reformed Church of England gave it a place in the *Common Prayer Book* and ordered it to be sung or said alternately by the minister and people standing, in the morning service on several festival days, viz: Christmas, the Epiphany, St. Matthias, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, John the Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, St. Andrew, and on Trinity Sunday. In all these days it takes the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Reformed Churches of the Continent have not given the Athanasian Symbol that direct formal sanction and prominence, as the Lutheran and the Anglican.* But they unanimously profess, in their symbolical books, the same doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation; reject the errors of the Ariana, Semiarians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Monothelites, and thus acknowledge in fact, if not always in form, the authority of the ancient ecumenical Creeds, in due subjection, of course, to the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures. The Second Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Bullinger in the name of the Swiss Churches in 1566, and approved by them, endorses, in very strong and unmistakable terms, the doctrine of the first four general councils and of the Athanasian Symbol.† Dr. David Pareus, the pupil and friend of Ursinus, and editor of his *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*, wrote a special

* Dr. Ebard, on the contrary, thinks that the Reformed Church makes in some respects even more account of the ecumenical Creeds than the Lutheran (Christl. Dogmatik, Vol. II, p. 89 and 90). This may be true as to the doctrine itself, but not as to the formal recognition of these Creeds. Dr. Ebard has overlooked the distinct recognition in the passage just quoted, in the preceding note, from the Lutheran Form of Concord, and the somewhat disrespectful manner in which Calvin at least (*De vera ecclesiae Reformatione*) speaks of the Symb. Nicaenum as a "carmen cantillando magis aptum, quam confessionis formula."

† Cap. XI. (p. 467 in Niemeyer's *Collectio Confess. in Ecol. Reform. publice*): "Quaecunque de Incarnatione Domini ne tri. Iesu Christi mysterie definita sunt ex Scripturis scripta, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententias quatuor primarum et praestantissimarum Synodorum celebratarum Nicene, Constantinopoli, Ephesi et Chalcedoni, una cum brevi Athanasii Symbolo, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero et ore libero ingenuo profitemur, condemnantes omnia his contraria. Atque ad hunc modum retinemus inviolatum sive integrum fidem Christianam, orthodoxam atque catholicam: scientes, symbolis praedictis nihil contineri, quod non sit conforme verbo Dei, et prouersus faciat ad sinceram fidei explicationem."

exposition of the Athanasian Creed, which, however, we have never seen.*

So far the faith in the doctrines of our Symbol was unshaken in the Church and was shared in common by the Greeks, (if we leave out of view their dissent from the *filioque*), Romans and Protestants. The Socinians alone differed from it and prepared the way for a still greater dissent. During the seventeenth century the origin of the Athanasian Creed was first made the subject of critical investigation by Continental and Anglican divines, and resulted in the almost unanimous rejection of the ancient tradition as to its authorship. This had the effect to weaken its authority as a primitive symbol, without undermining the faith in its contents. But when the skeptical and rationalistic flood of the eighteenth century swept away from a large portion of the Church the orthodox faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, this Creed was almost forgotten and figured only in Church histories among the many idle fabrications of a superstitious and intolerant age.

The reviving faith of the nineteenth century led to a gradual return to the ancient Confessions, first of the period of the Reformation and then also to those of the primitive Church. And although the Athanasian Creed is still comparatively neglected and even passed by in silence by eminent writers† on the very doctrines it so ably and clearly sets forth, it begins again to attract attention more and more and to be appreciated in its true worth without being unduly overestimated as in times past. Dr. Kling, an Evangelical divine of Würtemberg, claims for it a permanent significance in the Christian Church which will never give

* *Symbolum Athanasii, notis breviter declaratum.* Heidelb. 1618 (as Welch has it, i. e. p. 156), or 1619 (according to Kölner, p. 87). Probably the one gives the date of the preface, the other the date of publication.)

† Dr. Baur, in his learned and eminently scholarly, though unsound, work on the history of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of God, alludes to this Creed only *en passim* in a foot note, Vol. II, p. 33, and p. 168. But what is more surprising still, is that Dr. Dorner, in his invaluable Christological work, should not even mention it, so far as we can see from a cursory glance over both volumes and the index.

up its dogmatic substance.* Dr. Ebrard, one of the leading representatives of the modern German Reformed school of theology, makes still greater account of it in his "Christian Dogmatics,"† represents it as the completion of the ancient Catholic theology and christology, and asserts that it has been most fully taken up and best understood by the symbols and early divines of the Reformed communion.

As to our own country, I am not aware that the Athanasian Creed has ever been made the subject of serious discussion. The Episcopal Church, at its separate organization after the revolutionary war, has thrown it out of its Liturgy, together with the Nicene Creed, (which, however, was subsequently restored at the instance of the English bishops). But this omission must be traced to the prevalence of the latitudinarian spirit of the eighteenth century, which proposed, in the General Convention held at Philadelphia in 1785, a number of other omissions and changes in the Liturgy, the Thirty Nine Articles and even in the Apostles' Creed.‡ If the Episcopal Church were to be reorganized now, as it was in 1784, the Athanasian Creed, as well as the Nicene, would probably keep its place in the Liturgy, and many of its ministers would g'adly see it restored.—The Lutherans of the United States are still bound to this Creed as far as they respect at all the Book of Concord.—The Presbyterians and Congregationalists never, as far as I know, acknowledged it in form, but they teach substantially the same doctrine in their standards.—The Dutch Reformed Church has it as an appendix to its Liturgy, although it is probably never used there in public service.—The new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church, which

* Art. in Herzog's Encyclopaedie, Bd. I, 577.

† Band I, §188 p. 185 sq., u. Vol. II, §377, p. 89 sq.

‡ Comp. on this subject bishop White's Memoirs of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in the U. S. of A. Phil., 1820, p. 102 sqq. and 448 sqq., and the "Proposed Book," i. e., the provisional Liturgy of that Church as revised by the Convention of 1785. Many of the alterations, especially also the omission of the Nicene Creed and the article on the descent into hades in the Apostles' Creed, were subsequently given up on the remonstrance of the English bishops, who refused ordination, except on condition of the restoration of that article and of the Nicene Creed.

is as yet, however, merely of a provisional character, has received it, together with the two older ecumenical Creeds, among the Primitive Forms (p. 17-19), recommends its use on the last communion in the ecclesiastical year (p. 192), and requires the consent to it on the part of the candidates for the ministry in the ordination office (p. 245). This is a step in advance of every other Protestant communion of the country and just the reverse of the negative action of the Episcopal Church in 1785; but, as compared with the original position and doctrinal standards of the Churches of the Reformation, Lutheran, Anglican and Reformed, it is certainly no innovation, but a return rather to old usage under a modified, and we may say simplified and restricted form as to its actual use in public service. Whether the Athanasianum will retain its place at the final revision of this work, remains to be seen. The more closely it is examined, the less objectionable will it appear to those who cherish a strong and hearty belief in the ancient Christian doctrine of the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God.

CHARACTER AND CONTENTS.

Let us now examine the theology of the Athanasian symbol, the nature of which must determine its value and use in the Christian Church.*

The third ecumenical Creed is an epitome of ancient Catholic theology and sets forth, in clear logical statement, the orthodox faith concerning the fundamental articles of the triune God and the divine-human Saviour, without attempting to explain these unfathomable mysteries. It embodies the permanent results of the trinitarian and christological controversies which agitated, with uncommon violence, the Nicene and post-Nicene age, and were decided successively by the four general Synods held at

* On the theology of the Creed, which we regard as the most important part of the subject, Walch and Killner are altogether superficial and unsatisfactory.

Nice in 325, at Constantinople in 381, at Ephesus in 431, and at Chalcedon in 451.

For all practical purposes we may say the Apostles' Creed was sufficient, and it is so to this day, as a guide for catechetical instruction of the young and as a confession at baptism and confirmation. In this respect it can never be superseded or improved. Its very simplicity gives it a decided preference for popular catechetical and liturgical use over the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and every subsequent Confession of faith. But theologically and scientifically considered, it is defective, inasmuch as it does not clearly and unmistakably teach the Godhead of Christ and of the Holy Ghost in the full sense in which the Church intended it from the beginning.

Hence it was found necessary to define it more fully at the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, in opposition to the Arian and semi-Arian hypothesis which acknowledged Christ to have existed before the world and to be divine in some sense, but denied his equality with the Father, and which made the Holy Ghost the first creature of the Son, or a mere power and influence of the Godhead. The Nicene Creed calls Jesus Christ not simply the "only begotten Son our Lord," as the Apostles' Creed, but the "only begotten Son of God; begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance (*homoousious*) with the Father, by whom all things were made." This is certainly an advance, not in faith, we may say, for this was the same in the beginning, but in knowledge and in expression.

But the theology of the Church could not stop here. The Nicene Creed even in the more explicit form which it received at the Synod of Constantinople in 381, teaches, indeed, the true Godhead of Christ beyond the possibility of mistake, but it gives by no means yet a complete view of the holy Trinity. For in the first place, like the Apostles' Creed, it speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost separately only, without bringing out their oneness of sub-

stance, their mutual relations and distinctive personal properties, so as to exclude every possible form of tritheism on the one hand, and subordinationism on the other. Secondly, it is especially defective in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which did not come into full view at all during the Arian controversy. In the third place, it is entirely silent on the exact relation which holds between the divine and human nature of Christ, which was brought out only during the succeeding Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

In all these respects, and especially in the last, the Athanasian Symbol is a decided advance upon its two predecessors. It naturally divides itself into two parts. Each part is introduced by a prologue on the necessity and importance of holding the true faith as afterwards taught, and the whole concludes with an epilogue to the same effect. The first, and larger part, from v. 3-27,* teaches the true doctrine of the Trinity; the second, from v. 26-44, the doctrine of the Incarnation, or the proper constitution of Christ's Person.

1. The doctrine of the HOLY TRINITY, or the THEOLOGY, in the strict sense of the term. The Holy Trinity is the sacred symbol and type of the Christian religion, as distinct from the abstract monotheism of Judaism, Mahometanism, and deism on the one hand, and from the dualism and polytheism of the various forms of Paganism on the other. It comprehends all the truths and all the blessings of the revelation or self-communication of God for the salvation of men. Hence it is expressed in the baptismal formula, and confessed in the Apostles' Creed at the very entrance into the Christian Church in the sacrament of baptism (Matth. 28: 19), and made the all-comprehending and concluding benediction by the Apostle (2 Cor. 13: 14).

* The division in verses differs somewhat, although the succession is the same in all manuscripts and editions. The Book of Concord makes 42 verses, Weber 42. The best critical edition of the text is said to be that of Waterland. But the Latin codices, of which Montfaucon compared 12, Waterland 24, present a very small number of lectiones variantes, while the Greek copies, though less numerous (8), differ more materially.

It stands thus at the beginning and at the end of Christian worship and controls it throughout. But it is not simply in the two express passages alluded to, that the Bible teaches the Holy Trinity, nor in all the far more numerous passages which prove the Godhead of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, and which can only be reconciled with the fundamental idea of the Divine unity on the assumption of a trinity of persons in this unity of substance. We may say the doctrine runs through the entire Scriptures from beginning to end in the form of living facts, or in the exhibition of the revelation of the one only true and living God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the work of the creation, redemption and sanctification of the world. We need not be surprised, therefore, that this article stands out so prominently in the faith, worship and theology of the early Church, and gave rise to a long succession of doctrinal controversies. In this article again the divinity of Christ, as the incarnate God and Saviour of the race, formed naturally the central interest and fills the greater portion of the ancient Creeds, since it is the starting point of the Christian consciousness, determines the true idea of God, and was the main object of attack on the part of the ancient heresies, both of Jewish and heathen origin.

The Holy Trinity is a mystery which transcends our present power of comprehension and will furnish food for sacred meditation and praise throughout the countless ages of eternity. Nevertheless, as faith is never irrational and unnatural but merely superrational and supernatural, the subject matter of this article of faith can and ought to be clearly known and stated.

This is done with admirable clearness, precision, brevity and completeness in the Athanasian Creed. It betrays a mind which had evidently mastered the entire subject and fully appropriated it to the intellect as well as to the heart. It not only rejects *Unitarianism* or *Monarchianism*, which either as *Patriconianism*, or as *Ebionism*, denies the trinity altogether, but it avoids, also, with singular care and discrimination, the three erroneous forms in which the trinity

may be held and has been held at different times before and since. It excludes, in the first place, *Sabellianism* or *Modalism*, which teaches merely a trinity of revelation, not of essence, and thus falls back at last upon Unitarianism or abstract monotheism; secondly, *Tritheism*, which teaches three divine beings, and thus runs into polytheism; and thirdly, *Subordinationism*, which subordinates the Son to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to both, as partaking in part only, as it were, or to a limited extent, of the Divine essence, or dignity. These errors are not expressly mentioned, but necessarily denied by the positive statement of the opposite view.

The Symbol teaches the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, neither dividing the substance, nor confounding the persons.* 1) The *Unity* of the Godhead as to being, substance or essence: "The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coequal. . . . There are not three eternal, but one eternal. . . . not three uncreated, nor three unlimited; but one uncreated, and one unlimited. . . . not three almighty, but one almighty. . . . not three Gods, but one God. . . . not three Lords, but one Lord. . . . We are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say: There be three Gods, or three Lords." 2) The *Trinity* of persons or hypostases. These terms, it is true, must be taken in a peculiar sense, if applied to God. For in human relations three persons constitute three different beings. Yet there is no other term equally expressive. The trinity is in the first place immanent and essential, a distinction in God himself, independent of, and prior to, his manifestation in the world. It is a living relationship and process in God, the vitality, so to say, of infinite intelligence and infinite love. God was from everlasting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and will remain for ever Father, Son and Holy Ghost as certainly as he is supreme wisdom and supreme

* V. 3 and 4. In v. 27, there is an unimportant difference of reading as to the order. The *textus receptus*, as found in the Book of Concord, reads, *trinitas in unitate et unitas in trinitate*, while Waterland reverses the order, *unitas in trinitate et trinitas in unitate*. The latter is the order in the old English version and in the revision.

love. This trinity of essence reflects and manifests itself in the economical trinity or trinity of revelation,* that is the threefold divine work of creation, salvation and sanctification. "There is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. . . . The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God."

Each person by himself is God and Lord." 3) The internal relation of the three persons or their distinctive properties which, however, do not in the least interfere with the strict unity of substance. The Father is himself not made, nor created, nor begotten, but eternally *begetting* the Son; the Son is not made, nor created, but eternally *begotten* of the substance of the Father; the Holy Ghost is not made nor created, but eternally *proceeding* from the Father and the Son.† It is true, in this last point there is a difference of opinion between the Greek and the Latin Church, the former denying the procession from the Son as a later innovation and corruption. But the equality of the Son and the Father in its full sense necessarily requires the *filioque*. Here the Athanasianum follows the Latin view as brought out especially by St. Augustine,‡ and embodied also in the later clause to the Nicene Creed.

This same doctrine of the Trinity, including the *filioque*, was unanimously professed by the Reformers, reasserted in opposition to the Socinians and incorporated into the doctrinal standards of the evangelical Churches. Hase says that the view of the Athanasian symbol "was received without change into the symbolical books of the Lutheran

* We employ here a terminology which is much later, but the distinction itself between an essential or immanent trinity, and an economical or trans-
cendent trinity enters unquestionably into the ancient Creeds and is implied already in the doctrine of the *eternal generation* of the Son, or the eternal Sonship of Christ.

† Or to express it in nouns according to a later terminology, to the Father belongs negatively the *immaterialitas* or *spiritus*, positively the *generatio activa* Fili et *spiritus (nunc)* *active Spiritus Sancti*; to the Son belongs the *filatio generatio (passiva)* *paterna*, and *spiritio activo Spiritus S.*; to the Holy Ghost the *processio (spiritus)* and *spiritio passiva*.

‡ Comp. Augustin, De Trinit. IV, 20: *Nec possumus dicere, quod Spiritus S. et a Filiis non procedat; neque enim frusta idem Spiritus et Patris et Fili Spiritus dicuntur.* Nec video, quid illud significare voluerit, quoniam sufficiat in faciem discipulorum alii: *Arcipele Spiritum S.* Neque enim statim illi corporeus substantia Spiritus S. fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed et a Filiis procedere Spiritum.

Church and defended as the most sacred mystery of orthodox Christendom against every kind of opposition."* The Reformed Church, in some of its standards, is even more full and clear on the subject than the Lutheran.† Let us hear the four Reformed symbols which are most extensively used and enjoy the greatest authority, the second Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession.

The larger Helvetic Confession not only expressly endorses the ancient symbols, including the Athanasianum, as we have observed already, but also, in its exposition of the Trinity, is so clear and explicit as to leave no room for doubt whatever.‡ "We believe and teach that God is one as to essence and nature (unum esse easentia vel natura), self-subsisting and self-sufficient for all things, invisible, incorporeal, immense, eternal, the creator of all things visible as well as invisible, the highest good. . . . Nevertheless we believe and teach that this same infinite God one and undivided (unum et indivisum) is inseparably and without confusion distinct in persons (personis inseparabiliter et inconfuse esse distinctum) as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, so that the Father from eternity begat the Son (ab aeterno Filium generaverit), that the Son was begotten by an ineffable generation (filius generatione ineffabiliter genitus sit), and that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds from both and is to be adored with both (Spiritus S. vero procedat ab utroque, idque ab aeterno, eum utroque adorandus); so that there are not three Gods, but three persons consubstantial, coëternal and coëqual, distinct as to hypostases, and in order (not dignity) one preceding the other, yet without any inequality (nulla tamen inaequali-

* Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der Evang. Luth. Kirche, p. 171 of the 8th ed. Comp. his quotations from the Augsb. Conf., the Apology, and the old Lutheran divines, on the subsequent pages. Also Hase's Evang. Dogmatik, p. 515, 4th ed.; "Die hergebrachte Lehre ging ohne alle Durchbildung in die evang. Kirche über, theile durch Reception des Athanasianum, theils durch Wiederholung seines Grundgedankens, wie seiner praktischer Anwendung."

† Comp. Ebrard l. c. I. p. 186 seqq.

‡ Cap. 3 (not ep. 2, as Ebrard quotes), p. 470 ed. Niemeyer.

itate)." Then the Confession quotes several Scripture passages in support of this doctrine, and condemns not only the Jews and Mahomedans and all who blaspheme "sacrosanctam et adorandam hanc Trinitatem," but also those heretics who deny or pervert it, as the Monarchians, Patripassians, Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians and the like.

The Heidelberg Catechism, necessarily more brief, but sufficient for its purpose, says, in the 25th question: "Since there is but one divine essence, why speakest thou of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Because God hath so revealed himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are the only true and eternal God."

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England recognize the Athanasian Creed,* and teach in the very first article, which is retained unchanged in the Episcopal Church of the United States: "There is but one living and true God. . . . And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

The Westminster Confession which is held by the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies of England and the United States, approaches more closely to the phraseology and letter of the Athanasian Creed:† "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the

* Art. VIII. "of the Three Creeds," in the original articles as they still obtain in England. The Episcopal Church of the United States has not only removed the Athanasian symbol from the liturgical service, but also stricken out its name from said article, in the revision of 1801, retaining, however, the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, and also Art. I and II unaltered, which teach the same doctrine on the Trinity and the Incarnation.

† Chapt. II. § 8. Comp. the Larger Catech. Ques. VIII.-XL.

The Westminster standards are hardly ever noticed by German writers, not even by Ebrard and Schweizer, in their works on Reformed Dogmatics, while they refer to every other symbol, the Scotch Confession among the rest, which was superseded by the far more full and accurate Westminster Confession and Catechisms. It is characteristic that Niemeyer in his Collection of all the Reformed Symbols, originally omitted the Westminster standards entirely, but furnished them afterwards in an Appendix, with the excuse that he was unable before to find a single copy of them anywhere (quod ne unum quidam confessionis Westmonasteriensis give Puritanos exemplar usquam reperire potueram.)

Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten, nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, but it is not necessary, since the orthodoxy of the Protestant evangelical Churches on this article has never been seriously questioned, not even by Roman Catholic controversialists.

2. The doctrine of the INCARNATION, or the CHRISTOLOGY.
The doctrine of Christ is substantially contained in the confession of Peter, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, i. e. the promised Messiah, the Son of the living God, or in the declaration of John: The word became flesh, or in the word of Paul: God manifest in the flesh. The Church has ever believed in the mystery of the incarnation or the abiding union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, as the central truth of our holy religion and the foundation of all our hopes. Christ must be the Son of God and the Son of man in the fullest sense of the term, if he really is what he claims to be, the Mediator between God and man, and the Saviour of the world. To deny either his divinity, or his humanity, to reduce him either to a mere man, however great and good, or to resolve him into a gnostic phantom and spectral idea, is a radical heresy and overthrows the Christian salvation. Hence the uncompromising hostility of the ancient Church against Ebionism on the one hand, and Gnosticism on the other. But the exclusion of these two extreme errors is not sufficient. It may be admitted that Christ is both God and man, and yet the relation of the divine and human in him be so conceived as seriously to affect either their difference or their unity. The difference may be made so great, as virtually to result in two persons, or the unity may be so pressed, as to teach but one nature. The former is the Nestorian, the latter the Eutychian or Monophysite error. The one allows merely a mechanical and external relation between the divine and human nature in Christ, and substitutes the idea of an indwelling of the former in the latter or of a

moral fellowship for the idea of an incarnation. The other assumes a total absorption of the human nature into the divine in the act of the incarnation, so that Christ ceases to be man and cannot be our model for imitation. In both cases the truth of the incarnation and its result, the redemption and reconciliation of man with God, are seriously endangered and virtually annihilated. Nestorianism falls back at last upon an Ebionite christology, while Eutychianism ends logically in Gnosticism and Pantheism.

Here now the Athanasian Creed, in the second part, steers with equally sound instinct and discrimination between the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, as it steered in the doctrine of the Trinity between Tritheism and Unitarianism. It teaches that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, equal to the Father as to his divine nature, equal to man as to his human nature, sin only excepted, and yet one and the same Christ, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person,* not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God.

It is interesting to compare with it the confession of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which rejected the Eutychian heresy and gave at the same time an exposition of the orthodox doctrine in these words:

"Following the holy fathers, we all teach unanimously that we confess one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and at the same time truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; of the same substance with the Father as to his Godhead, and of the same substance at the same time with us as to his manhood; in all things like unto us, except sin; eternally begotten of the Father according to his Godhead, but in the last days for our sake and for our salvation (born) of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God (*ης θεού*), according to his manhood; one and the same Christ (*εν ταύτῃ υἱός οὐν* X.), Son, Lord, Only-begotten, who is known in two natures† without mixture and change;‡ with-

* *Umus omnino, non confusione substantias, sed unitate personae,* v. 36. This sounds like a direct denial of the Eutychian theory and seems to point to a period after the fourth general Council in 451. But the same view was substantially advanced before Eutyches, and opposed in similar forms as in this passage. Comp. Waterland and Kölner, p. 89sq.

† *εν ταύτῃ φύσει*, in duabus naturis, as all Latin copies read, instead of the other reading, *εν ταύτῃ φύσει*, which might be understood in a Eutychian or Monophysite sense.

‡ *αντίγραφος, αρπαγή*—against Eutychianism.

out division and separation,|| so that the difference of the natures is by no means abolished by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature is saved, and they are united into one person and one hypostasis,§ not divided or torn into two persons, but one and the same Christ: as the prophets from on high and the Lord Jesus Christ himself have taught us, and the faith of the fathers has handed down to us."

The statement of the Athanasian Creed is more simple and condensed and omits the term "mother of God," which is not to be regretted,* but it is equally, if not more clear and explicit. It also illustrates the relation of the two natures in Christ by the union of soul and body in man. It then enumerates, like the Apostles' Creed, the leading facts in the life of the Saviour to his return in glory, and concludes with the doctrine of the last judgment, where the good shall receive everlasting life and the wicked everlasting damnation.

The christology of the Athanasian Creed has likewise passed over, without any material change, into the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Leaving out of view the Lutheran doctrine, we will confine ourselves again to the four leading confessions of the Reformed communion.

The Heidelberg Catechism teaches,† that Christ as a Mediator and Deliverer must be *very man*, and perfectly righteous, because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin, and one who is himself a sinner, cannot satisfy for others; and that he must be at the same time in *one person very God*, that he might by the power of his Godhead sustain, in his human nature, the burden of

|| αὐτοπραγμα, αὐτοπραγμα—against Nestorianism.

§ εἰς τὸ σωματικόν τὸ μόνον οὐσίαν.

* It must be admitted that the term, *Θεοῦ*, so obnoxious to the Nestorians, has a good sense, and follows with logical necessity from the orthodox view of the Incarnation. But it is equally certain that it is one-sided (*Θεοῦ*; and *Θεοπαρασκευῆς* would be more complete), that it was not used by the apostles and ante-Nicene fathers, that it is liable to be grossly misunderstood by the illiterate, that it has been greatly abused and made the basis of an excessive, yea idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin in the Greek and Roman Churches. We prefer the Scriptural term, "Mother of our Lord." Luke 1. 43.

† Quæst XV-XVIII. Comp. Qu. XXIX-XL.

God's wrath, and might obtain for and restore to us righteousness and life.

The second Helvetic Confession,* after teaching distinctly the eternal generation of the Son and his strict equality with the Father, goes on as follows: "The same eternal Son of the eternal God, we believe and teach, has become the Son of man of the seed of Abraham and David, without the cohabitation of man, as Ebion said, being conceived in the purest manner, by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, according to the evangelical history." Then after rejecting the Gnostic and Appollinarian view of the humanity of Christ, it continues: "We acknowledge in one and the same Christ our Lord two natures, the divine and the human, and these we hold to be so connected that they are not absorbed, or confused, or mixed, but united or conjoined in one person, without destroying the permanent properties of the natures; so that we worship one Lord Christ, not two, who is very God, of one substance with the Father according to his divine nature, and very man, of one substance with us men according to his human nature, sin only excepted. Therefore we abominate the Nestorian dogma which makes two out of one Christ, and dissolves the unity of person; so also we utterly execrate the folly of Eutyches, the Monophysites and Monotheletes who expunge the property of the human nature."

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Anglican Communion:† The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man," etc.

The Westminster Confession is equally clear and distinct on this subject.‡ "The Son of God, the second per-

* Cap XI: *De Iesu Christo vera Deo et homine, unico mundo Salvatore,* p. 488 sq. ed. Niemeyer. † Art. II.

‡ Chapt. VIII, § 2.

son in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance: so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man."

It is perfectly plain, then, that the theology and christology of the Athanasian symbol is to this day the public doctrine of the Evangelical as well as the Roman Catholic Churches. To recognize and acknowledge it in form is perfectly consistent with orthodox Protestantism. To reject it altogether, is at the same time to reject the corresponding articles of all our leading confessions of faith.

The only real difficulty in the way, is the *damnatory* clause in the prologue and epilogue of the Athanasian Creed, which makes the eternal salvation dependent upon the reception of this faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. This is the great objection to this symbol even in the eyes of many who otherwise altogether agree with its contents. No doubt the objection would be serious and valid, if the damnatory clause referred to the *form* as well as to the *substance* of faith, and required us to condemn any particular *persons*, especially all those who held loose and unsatisfactory philosophical views on the Holy Trinity, as was the case even with most of the ante-Nicene fathers, not to speak of such men as Milton, Watts, Schleiermacher, Neander, Bushnell and many other distinguished divines in the later ages of the Christian Church. But this is a false interpretation of the clause. The more it is examined and understood in its proper sense, the less objectionable will it appear.

For in the first place, if faith is at all saving, the rejection of faith must be condemning. The assertion of truth

is necessarily also the negation of error. There is no avoiding the conclusion. "He that believeth," says the highest authority, "and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."* "He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."†

Secondly, the energy and earnestness of faith in its negative as well as positive expression, must not be confounded with intolerance and uncharitableness. The question is here not of persons at all, but simply of truth and error. We are bound as Christians to love the sinner and heretic, and to labor for his conversion, while we abhor and condemn his sin and error.

Thirdly, the Protestant symbols, both Lutheran and Reformed, do substantially the same thing which is found so objectionable in the Athanasian Creed. The Augsburg Confession, the Articles of Smalkald, the Form of Concord, the Helvetic, Gallic, Belgic, Scotch, and other Confessions, expressly condemn, in the strongest terms, such as *damnamus, abominamur, detestamur, execramur*, the trinitarian and christological heresies of the Gnostics, Docetists, Ebionites, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Servetians, Socinians and others.

Finally, in all these cases salvation and condemnation is not made to depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the logical form of statement or any particular degree of knowledge of these mysteries, but only upon the presence or absence of *faith* in the doctrinal *substance* or the great *truth* contained in the statement. The form of expression is simply the outer hull to guard the kernel of truth against misapprehension and perversion. The strength and nourishment lies in the kernel, not in the hull. So it is the truth alone, as apprehended by faith, which can save, and can save a child and a barbarian as well as the ripest and profoundest scholar. But what is the central truth, the main object of saving Christian faith? It is undoubtedly

* Mark 16:10. † John 3:18. Comp. n. 24, 6, 40 and 47.

[April,

the one only true and living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who made us, who redeemed us, and who sanctifies us, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man, the only Saviour. This is the faith taught in the Protestant confessions, as well as in the three ancient Creeds; this faith is necessary for salvation, while its wilful rejection must exclude from it; this faith will remain the same to the end of time, however much its philosophical apprehension and logical expression may change and improve with the progressive march of theological science.*

It is in this sense, and in this only, that the ordination service in the new German Reformed Liturgy requires the assent of the candidate of the ministry to the Athanasian as well as the Apostles' and Nicene Creed. The question first gives the contents of these Creeds by way of comment: "Do you believe in one God the Father; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father; and in one Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and with the Father and the Son one God Almighty? And do you believe in one holy Catholic Church, in which is given one true Baptism for the remission of sins? And do you consent unto the *system of faith* set forth in the three Creeds, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed?"† Here the "*system of faith*" to which the candidate is expected solemnly to declare his adherence, is just the belief in the triune God as stated before. But for the purpose of making it still more clear it might be better perhaps to substitute for the last *And do you*, the words, *Do you thus*, i. e., in the sense previously indicated.

* Dr. Kling in his short article on the Athanasian Creed, in Herzog's Encyclopedia, takes the same view of the offensive clause: "Das Vorurtheil," he says, "wird schwinden in dem Maasse, als man sich darüber verständigen wird, dass es (the Athan. S.) uns nur angeht hinsichtlich seines wesentlichen dogmatischen Gehalts, das heisst, insofern als es die Einheit der Gottheit in der dreifachen persönlichen Unterschiedenheit und umgekehrt, und die vollkommene Gottheit und vollkommene Menschheit des Einen untheilbaren Christus als unvermengt, unverwandelt und ungeschieden feststellt." . . . "Darin liegt seine bleibende Bedeutung, und nie wird sich die christliche Kirche diesen Gehalt und unser Symbolum, insofern es denselben in sich trägt, nehmen lassen, wie auch immer die positive theologische Vermittlung desselben sich ändern und vervollkommen mag."

† p. 244 sq.

VALUE AND USE.

With this explanation of the damnable clause we should think that no strong believer in the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God as the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, can justly deny the Athanasian Creed a great and permanent value, and object to its reception into the new Liturgy among the Primitive Forms, together with the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. This was not done without due consideration and precedent. Besides the formal recognition of it in several symbolical books of the Reformed Church, it has long had a place in the Anglican, and the Dutch Liturgies. It has also quite recently been embodied in the new hymn book and liturgy of the Reformed Church of Elberfeld, which is perhaps more strictly Reformed than any other congregation in Germany and Switzerland. This work, published in 1853, in addition to the Psalms and two hundred and forty three well selected choice hymns, accompanied with the tunes, contains the Heidelberg Catechism, a number of prayers and short liturgical services, the three ancient Creeds, and also the doctrinal decisions of the Councils of Ephesus A. D. 431, and of Chalcedon A. D. 451.

It is not intended, of course, to place these Creeds on a par with the holy Scriptures in a Romanizing sense, or to weaken in the least the fundamental Protestant principle concerning the rule of faith. The authority of the Word of God is absolute, that of the Confessions of the Church is relative only and conditioned by their agreement with, it; the former is, strictly speaking, the only rule of faith the *norma normans fidei*, the latter are only exponents of the true sense of the Bible and safeguards of sound doctrine, the *norma normata doctrinae*.

Among these Confessions of faith the three Symbols of the ancient Church have always held, and should continue to hold, the highest place, because they are nearest the apostolic fountain; they really contain the fundamental articles of the Christian faith in the shortest and simplest

form ; they are ecumenical or universal, being received by all the branches of orthodox Christendom, and they form a link of union between the Church of the present with the Church of the past, up to the age of the confessors, martyrs and immediate disciples of the apostles. The most sacred associations of many centuries cluster around them ; they are fraught with the piety, faith, hope, joy and spiritual experience of God's people of all generations and tongues. Why should the Athanasian Creed be banished from its former time-honored position, since it is only the legitimate completion of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, embodies, as we have seen, the purest results of the theology of the first five centuries, and gives the clearest and fullest expression to the Church's faith in the triune God and the divine-human Saviour of the world,—a faith so earnestly and emphatically reconfessed, as with one voice, by all the symbols of evangelical Christendom.

In addition to their doctrinal value the ancient Creeds have also from time immemorial been used for liturgical purposes. Here a proper distinction must be made.

The Apostles' Creed stands decidedly first on account of its simplicity for all practical and popular use. It alone, as already intimated, is properly adapted for catechetical instruction, for baptism and confirmation, and should also be more frequently confessed than any other in the regular service of the Lord's day, as the solemn utterance of the common congregation and a united act of worship, like singing and prayer.

The Nicene Creed, being already more artificially constructed and rising somewhat in its terminology above the ordinary popular comprehension, should be confined to communion or festival seasons, where it may take the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Athanasian Symbol, finally, being still more theological and scientific in tone and expression, might be said and sung once a year, either as the new German Reformed Liturgy directs, on the last communion season, or what perhaps would be more appropriate, as the canticle for

Trinity Sunday. The frequent use of it in the mediaeval Latin, and the Anglican Protestant Churches, is to be attributed in part to the former scarcity of hymns, now so happily supplied by our rich treasures of sacred poetry, and can, therefore, not be taken as a precedent. The most solemn and impressive form of professing these Creeds in public worship is the chanting by the choir, either alone or in connection with the whole congregation properly trained for responsive liturgical worship.

Mercersburg, Pa., March, 1859.

P. S.

**ART. V.—THE PALATINATE: A HISTORICO-GEOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.
ITS HISTORY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE EXTINCTION OF
ELDER ELECTORAL LINE, IN 1559.**

THE lands on the Middle Rhine, which afterward formed the Electorate of the Rhenish Palatinate, were in antiquity inhabited by the Vangiones, Nemetes and Tribochi, German tribes, who were conquered by Julius Cæsar and incorporated in the Roman province of Germania Superior. During the decline of the empire the confederated German hordes of the Alemanni crossed the Rhine, but after their defeat by Clovis, in the battle of Zülpich, 496, they were reduced to subjection and the Franks extended their conquests beyond the Neckar.

Thus the mass of the inhabitants in these regions consisted of the relics of old Roman subjects, some stray bands of vanquished Alemanni and the domineering Franks, among whose warriors the lands were divided; to this mixed population may be added Saxon colonists, whom Charlemagne afterward, in 804, settled on the left bank of the Rhine.

This beautiful river, with its vine-clad hills and dense population, became soon the centre of the Frankish empire and the favorite residence of its kings. New cities arose; cathedrals, churches and monasteries were built and richly endowed. Clothaire II (584-628) founded the bishopric of Spire, and Dagobert I (628-638) enlarged that of Worms with possessions on the east of the river. Charlemagne brought architects from Italy to adorn his beloved Ingelheim with marble palaces, and still existing ruins show that Kreuznach, Worms, Lautern, Neuhausen, Spire, Ladenburg, Selz and others, vied with it in splendor. These *Königspfalzen* became the scene of the glittering diets and crowded national assemblies at which the fate of kings and states was decided; there foreign embassies from Constantinople and Mohammedan Spain were pompously received, and twenty-five conquered nations carried their homage and tributes to the throne of the mighty emperor.

The Rhenish provinces depended directly on the crown and were governed by a Count Palatine.* Lewis the Pious gave them to his son Lewis the German, in 883, and after the dismemberment of the Frankish empire by the treaty of Verdun they belonged to Germany, yet without being incorporated with the two powerful duchies of Lorraine and Franconia, that arose on the downfall of the royal dignity in the family of Charlemagne.

Little is known of the first counts on the Rhine. The Lords of Lâche (de Lacu), so called from their castle on the lake in the mountains of Andernach, wealthy and powerful barons in the dioceses of Cologne and Trêves were the earliest counts palatine mentioned in documents

* See my first article on the *Palatinate*, in *Mercersburg Review*, Jan., 1859. Page 145, &c. seq.

The Rhine lands, like the rest of ancient Germany, were divided into districts or valleys—*Gau*—separated by the natural boundaries of mountains or rivers. On the west of the Rhine lay the *Kraich-Gau* toward the duchy of Alemania (Switzerland), the *Gardach-Gau* belonging to Worms, the *Neckar-Gau* on the river of that name, with the *Elsenz-Gau* and *Lobden-Gau* between the Odenwald and the Rhine. On the west of that river the *Spira Gau*, *Wormazfeld* and the *Naka-Gau*, and toward the Lower Rhine the *Einrich-Gau* and *Trach-Gau* which formed integral parts of the future Palatinate.

from 970, during the reign of the Emperor Otho I. Herman I., count of the Ruhr-gau in Franconia, held that dignity; it was, however, his successor, Henry de Lâche, who in 1093 took the title of *Pfälzgraf bey Rhein*. Yet the influence of that family had already ceased and their allodial territories become alienated, when the Emperor Conrad III., in 1142, conferred the Rhenish Palatinate on his sister's son, Herman of Stahleck. This wild warrior, while enforcing his claim to the bishopric of Worms, began a feud with the not less obstinate Arnold, archbishop of Mayence. The devastation of the ecclesiastical lands, caused by this private feud, was severely punished by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who, on his return from Italy in 1156, held an imperial diet at Worms, and there in the presence of all the princes and dignitaries of the empire, condemned the count palatine and his knights, to an indignant punishment,* for the breach of peace, and granted the Palatinate to his brother Conrad of Hohenstaufen.

Thus, an enterprising prince of a distinguished family, now united the palatine dignity to the sovereign power over the Rhine provinces, which henceforth from imperial crown-lands are transformed into an independent principality, soon destined to take a prominent rank among the States of the Empire.

A new period begins here in the history of the Palatinate, and Conrad, (1155–1195) the first in the series of its princes, possessed the peculiar qualities to be the founder of a state. From his castle on the Jettenbübel at Heidelberg, he was watching, like the eagle from his eyrie, every opportunity for extending his dominion; and being confident of the support of his imperial brother, he boldly laid his hand on the fiefs, bailiwicks, pious legacies and church-lands of the neighborhood, while the poor hamlet at the

* This public punishment for feudal war was enacted against the count palatine and ten of his barons at Worms for the *last time*; it consisted in their carrying each a dog the distance of four miles. The archbishop was pardoned on account of his ecclesiastical dignity and old age. Henry of Stahleck, died soon after of a broken heart, in the monastery of Eberach near Mayence.

foot of the mountain from a cluster of fishermen's huts, rose in population and wealth to the rank and privileges of the beautiful city of Heidelberg. In those times the sword often became the arbiter of disputes; thus the castle of Stahleck with Bacherach, the ecclesiastic lands on the Moselle and the Neckar were occupied; and bishop and baron, were forced to render homage to the warlike Pfalzgrave, who extended his feudal dominions to the Lower Rhine.

Conrad had early lost his sons, and his surviving daughter, Agnes, was now the only heiress of the Palatinate, at a time when the Ghibelline influence was predominant in Germany, under the powerful sway of Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI. It is, therefore, only to the romantic spirit of chivalry and lady-love, that we can ascribe the strange turn of fortune: that of the Ghibelline Conrad giving the hand of his daughter and the succession in the Palatinate to the *Guelf*, Henry count of Brunswick, the son of Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, and the most inveterate enemy of the Ghibelline dynasty. But so it happened, and in 1195 Henry III followed his father-in-law by right of his wife, Agnes, and with the approbation of the emperor, became the first hereditary Elector of the Palatinate.

Yet once more the ancient family hatred boiled fiercely up; Henry having supported his younger brother, Otho IV, now duke of Brunswick and emperor elect, against Frederick II, of Hohenstaufen, the latter, who prevailed in that long and bloody contest, hurled the ban of the empire against the count palatine and committed the military execution of the sentence to his partisan Lewis of Wittelsbach, duke of Bavaria, to whom he awarded the palatine dignity and the possession of the principality.

The sword was again drawn and swept over the lovely land; yet Henry the Guelf, made good his stand, and it was only on his demise, in 1227, that a compromise was made, by which his daughter, Agnes, the heiress of his lands, married Otho, prince of Bavaria, and thus a final union of the Rhenish Electorate and the duchy of Bavaria took place in 1231, when the new Count Palatine Otho succeeded his father.

This was the last transfer of the electoral dignity of the Palatinate by imperial nomination during the middle ages. United to Bavaria, it remained thenceforth hereditary in the Wittelsbach dynasty, though subdivisions among ambitious and quarrelsome brothers soon took place. The first of these was at Landshut in 1255, between the sons of Otho; the younger, Henry, obtained Lower Bavaria, while the elder brother, Lewis, with the palatinate dignity, held Upper Bavaria and the Rheinpfalz.* This flourishing country consisted at that time of Stahleck, Stahlberg, Bachcrach, Caub, Pfalzgrafenstein, Heimbach and other possessions in the Rhine-Gau; Stromberg and Alzey in the Nahe-Gau; Neustadt, Winzingen, and Wachenheim in the Hardt mountains; the two castles and city of Heidelberg, and Weinheim on the *Bergstrasse*, with many other dispersed lands, such as Epstein, Erbach, Thurn and Landseron, all situated in the most delightful regions of Germany, yet not sufficiently protected during the unruly times that followed on the death of Frederick II. It was, therefore, that the Count Palatine Lewis joined the confederacy of the imperial free cities on the Rhine, Maine and Neckar, by which mutual protection was guaranteed among the allies.

Lewis was called the Severe, on account of the cruelty with which he in an outburst of jealousy had brought his innocent wife, Mary of Brabant, to the block. His second wife, Mathilda of Habsburg, bore him two sons, Rudolph and Lewis. On his death in 1294, he left to the first the electoral dignity and the Palatinate on the Rhine, and to the second, Upper Bavaria, to which, in 1314, was added the Imperial crown, and in 1340, the inheritance of Lower

* Lower or Eastern Bavaria—*Niederbayern*—extended from the Bohemian mountains across the Danube, south to the Tyrolese Alps, and bordered eastward on the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Archduchy of Austria and the Archiepiscopacy of Salzburg. Its capital was Landshut on the river Isar. Upper or Western Bavaria—*Oberbayern*—began on the upper Danube ascending southward to the County of Tyrol in the Alps, and bordering on the north and west on the Burggraviate of Nurnberg, the Duchy of Wurtemberg and the Bishopric of Augsburg. Its capital was Munich—Muenchen—on the river Isar.

Bavaria by the extinction of the ducal line of Henry on the death of his great grand son John of Wittelsbach. Lewis was still a child, but Rudolph, being married to the daughter of the Emperor Adolph of Nassau, and supporting his father-in-law in his war with Albert of Austria, the count Palatine was overthrown in the celebrated battle at Göllheim, near the Donnersberg, in which Adolph fell, and the unhappy provinces of the Palatinate suffered for several years the most awful devastations by the Austrian armies of the revengeful Albert. To increase the misery of the Pfälzers, Albert had called to his assistance King Philip the Fair, of France, and thus the wild hordes of that country likewise invaded the Rhine province and made their memory as hateful in 1301, by rapine, murder and all the horrors of war, as afterwards in the campaigns of Lewis XIV, in the 17th century.

What an awful lesson to mankind, that the innocent nations must pay the penalty for the madness of their kings. Nay, it is a melancholy truth that no German state ever suffered so much from family disputes and divisions as Bavaria and the Palatinate. The Wittelsbach dynasty gave the unchristian example of almost continual civil wars, of children against their parents, of brother against brother, or of collateral lines of the same race fighting against one another, and thus for centuries impeding or retarding the progress and development of countries so happily situated and endowed with all the blessings of bountiful providence. Already Rudolph and Lewis began the hateful contest, and had hardly come to a compromise, when the German Emperor Henry VII, of Luxemburg died during his victorious campaign in Italy, 1311. A double election between hostile parties in Germany became now unavoidable; and when the Habsburg adherents chose the Archduke Frederic the Handsome, of Austria, and the Luxemburgers, the Duke of Bavaria, Lewis IV, the Elector of the Palatinate, full of envy and hatred against his brother, declared for Austria, and thus caused his own destruction. Lewis, the Bavarian, carried off the victory, as is well known, and having been crowned German King in

Aachen, he invaded the Palatinate and expelled his brother Rudolph, who fled to Austria, where he died of a broken heart in 1319. The Rhenish Palatinate had thus by force of arms, again become united to Bavaria, and Lewis the Emperor, disregarding the claims of his nephews, ruled over the land as a sovereign. But his disposition was kind and compassionate; his nephews, Rudolph and Rupert, had accompanied him to Italy and fought with chivalrous bravery in Rome. Thus, the heart of the uncle relented, and in the celebrated treaty of Pavia of 1329, he restored the hereditary dominions to the palatine princes.*

* THE WITTELSBACH DYNASTY.

LEWIS II, the Severe, Duke of Upper Bavaria †1294.

RUDOLPH I, Elector of the Palatinate †1319.	Lewis IV. the Bavarian Emperor 1314. †1347.		
Adolph resigns 1327.	RUDOLPH II, Elector †1368.		
RUPERT II. Elector †1398.	Anna married to the Emperor Charles IV. †1378.		
RUPERT III Emperor †1410.			
LEWIS III Elector †1436.	John of Neumarkt. Count Palatine of Upper Pal. †1448.	Stephen of Simmern and Zweibrücken. †1459.	Otho Count, Pal. of Mosbach. †1461.
CHRISTOPHER, King of Denmark and Norway †1448.	The younger Simmern line succeeds to the Electorate in 1559.	Frederic of Simmern & Sponheim. †1480, &c.	Lewis the Black, of Zweibrücken and Veldenz. †1490.
LEWIS IV Elector, †1449.	FREDERIC I the Victorious Elector. †1476.	Rupert, Elector of Cologne, †1480.	The Veldenz line becomes extinct 1595.
PHILIP the Sincere, Elector, †1508.			
LEWIS V, Elector, 1544.	Rupert the Pretender of Lower Bavaria. †1504.	FREDERIC II the Wise (?) Elector, †1556.	
OTHO HENRY the Magnanimous, Count Palatine of Neuburg-Sulzbach, Elector, 1556, †1559.	With Otho Henry, the elder electoral line becomes extinct in 1559.	Philip the Warlike, †1548.	

The emperor kept for himself the duchy of Upper and part of Lower Bavaria, but gave back to the sons of his brother, the Palatinate on the Rhine and the north-eastern portion of Lower Bavaria, the ancient province of the *Nord-Gau*, which thenceforth remained united to the *Rheinpfalz*, under the name of Palatinate of Bavaria or *Oberpfalz*. Yet a family compact was made by which the two lines of the Wittelsbach House pledged themselves as members of the same family, that they would not alienate any part of their possessions, and that the electoral dignity, with the consent of the other electors, should alternate between the palatine and ducal lines, beginning with the *Rheinpfalz*; in spite of this agreement, this title nevertheless continued without interruption, attached to the Palatinate.

Of the three sons of Rudolph I, Adolph, Rudolph and Rupert, the first had already resigned and died in 1327, leaving a son Rupert II. Thus the two uncles and the nephew now, according to the treaty of Pavia, took possession of the Palatine Electorate and the Upper Palatinate of Bavaria and of many smaller feudal dependencies dispersed partly on the Upper Rhine and partly in the duchy of Bavaria or neighboring territories. Rudolph II took the electoral dignity and divided the provinces with his brother and nephew. But it was soon to be seen how far the conditions of the treaty of Pavia could be enforced; for by the marriage of his daughter Anna to the ambitious and grasping Emperor Charles IV, King of Bohemia and, successor of his uncle Lewis IV, the Bavarian, (†1347) he had most imprudently given his son-in-law claims to the inheritance of his estates. This was an open infraction of the family compact of 1329, and on his death in 1353, the emperor invading the Upper Palatinate, united it to his neighboring kingdom in spite of all the remonstrances of the Palatine heirs and the German princes. The wily Charles gained the friendship of Rupert I, by unjustly conferring on him the Palatine dignity, in prejudice of his nephew, the son of Adolph, and in the *Golden Bull*, which

was published in 1356, the Pfalzgraf bei Rhein obtained the permanent Vicariate of the Empire, the High-Stewardship (*Erztruchsessens-Amt*), the first rank among the secular electors and the *indivisible* possession of the Palatinate, as an important protection against the hostile pretensions of the collateral dukes of Bavaria!

Rupert I (1353–1390) considerably enlarged his principality by the purchase of the county of Zweibrücken with Hombach and Bergzabern in 1385, and by the acquisition of Sinsheim, Mosbach, Neckargemünd, Bretten, Sickingen and other territories and monasteries, which he held as bailiff of the empire. Yet more than all this, the memory of Rupert I has been immortalized by the foundation of the celebrated University of Heidelberg, which having been afterward enlarged and richly endowed by the Emperor Rupert III, and passed unscathed through the scholastic animosities of the fifteenth century, so nobly sustained the great cause of religious liberty and reformation in the sixteenth century. Rupert I died childless in 1390, and his nephew, Rupert II, son of Adolph, then an old man sixty-five years of age, followed him in the Rheinpfalz.

We have now arrived at a time when the Palatinate is to exert a still greater influence on the affairs of Germany and its prince, to wear the imperial crown. Every one of the different tribes of the German nation had already seen its native dynasty attain that dignity. Saxony, Franconia, Swabia, Austria, Bavaria, and Bohemia, had in turn placed kings on the throne of the Sacred Roman Empire of the German nation. That honor awaited now the small principality on the Rhine; but at a time (1400–1410) when it hardly could be considered as an advantage. Never before had Germany been in a more wretched condition; never so desolated by civil feuds, or oppressed by powerful princes, wrangling cities, arrogant bishops and robber-knighta. The sovereignty of Italy had been lost during the wars of Guelfs and Ghibellines; the proud Visconti had made himself duke of Milan and—worst of all, the emperor, the inactive and dissolute Wenceslas, far away from Germany, had become the prisoner of his own nobles in Bohemian.

It was then that the Electors of Mayence and Treves, with some secular princes, by a very remarkable conspiracy, assembled at Ronse in 1400, and deposing the Bohemian idler, offered the diadem to the Count Palatine, Rupert III, who in 1398 had followed his father in the Rheinpfalz. Rupert, in return, freely granted rights and privileges, tolls and territories, and promised to restore the tranquility of Germany and to reconquer Italy. But being as cunning as he was active and brave, he began with marching an army into Bohemia, and on the refusal of Wenceslas to abdicate, quickly took possession of the Upper Palatinate, which so unjustly had been dismembered from his hereditary state. Rupert then exerted himself to bring order into the German chaos, and crossed the Alps with 15,000 horse. But the time of German superiority had passed! He was vanquished by the condottieri of Visconti at Brescia, and though he afterwards occupied Padova, he soon found himself abandoned both by Italian mercenaries and German feudatories and obliged to return to Germany, where all was in inextricable confusion among the contending parties of two emperors and three popes.

Though almost abandoned by his allies, Rupert III continued bravely engaged in his royal duties until his death in 1410, when his states became again divided among his four surviving sons. The eldest, Lewis III, obtained the electoral dignity and the Rheinpfalz, and was the ancestor of the elder Palatine line that became extinct in 1559. His second son, John, succeeded in the Upper Palatinate, which again reverted to the electorate in 1448, on the death of his son Christopher, king of the Calmarian Union in the North. Stephen, the third son, formed a new line as Count Palatine of Simmern-Zweibrücken and his descendant, Frederick III of Simmern, by the inheritance of the electorate in 1559, became the ancestor of the younger Palatine dynasty. The fourth son, Otho, Count of Mosbach, obtained the paternal possessions on the Neckar, with Sinsheim, Kaiserwerth on the Rhine, and Wildenstein on the Danube, with other territories and one thousand florins

a year. Thus in spite of treaties and family compacts, the Palatinate had now shared the fate of Bavaria by being divided in different lines, that scattered its strength and exposed it to the continual trouble of family disputes. Yet in the beginning all went off well; Lewis III had been drilled in the school of his able father. With great ability and consummate prudence he kept aloof from the parties during the period of an almost incredible confusion, when three German kings and three Romish popes contended for superiority and throwing his sword in the scale of Sigismund of Hungary, he secured the favor and friendship of the new emperor, and maintained the dignity of the empire as the imperial lieutenant in the celebrated Council of Constance, where, in 1414, the European world had assembled to compose the great schism of the Church and to burn the heretics.

It was our Count Palatine who superintended the awful execution of John Huss. Lewis possessed more the qualities of a brave knight than of a learned clerk. He was blindly devoted to the Romish Church and felt no pity for the noble minded and enthusiastic reformer. Beneath the fire pile in the square of Constance, on the 6th of July, 1415, the Vicar of the empire surrendered the martyr into the hands of the civil magistrates with the harsh words: "Take away this John Huss, who according to the sentence of our gracious Lord, the Roman King, and at our own command, is to be burnt to death as a heretic." Lewis then led the victim to the stake and denying him the right of speech, gave the signal to the executioners to light the funeral pile. Nay, by one of those strange fatalities we meet in human life, his own brother John, the Count Palatine of Neuburg in Oberpfalz, soon after, with equal fanaticism, ordered the eloquent and faithful friend of Huss, Jerome of Prague, on his return to Bohemia, to be captured and sent back to Constance to meet certain death. But the times and their opinions change.

— Tempora mutantur
Et nos mutamur in illis!

The protestant grand-children of these illiberal princes afterwards viewed as deadly crimes what their ancestors no doubt gloried in as true Catholic virtues! For the childless and suffering Ott' Henry, the last stripling of the electoral line, considered with anguish the extinction of the dynasty as the just decree of Providence, and that it was a merited retribution "that the stem should wither and perish, whose founder had been stained with the innocent blood of the martyrs of truth."* John and Stephen were defeated by the avenging sword of the Hussites, and fled from the horrible battle-field of Traus in 1431, while Lewis, after long sufferings and blindness, died in 1436. Under the influence of the monks, he had become devout, and performed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. In his latter years he endowed churches and monasteries; but left a more grateful memory in the protection he so nobly extended to the University at Heidelberg. This institution had become richly endowed and divided into several Colleges, with fourteen professors and a numerous attendance of students from every part of Germany. It rose in reputation under its worthy President, Marsilius von Inghen, and its celebrated library already contained a precious collection of manuscripts and all the scholastic and theological works of the age.

Lewis IV was a sickly child of twelve years at the death of his father. Under the guardianship of Count Otho of Mosbach, the Palatinate enjoyed many years of peace and prosperity. Lewis was an excellent young prince; he defended his Rheinish provinces gallantly against the roving hordes of French mercenaries, the Armagnacs, whom the Emperor Frederick III, most imprudently, had called to his assistance against the Swiss in 1444, and brought the rebellious Counts of Lützelstein to obedience in 1447. Few years after his marriage with Margaret of Savoy, the young elector died in his twenty-fifth year, 1449, leaving an infant son, Philip, to the protection of his able brother,

* See the History of the Rheinish Palatinate by Prof. Dr. Lewis Häusser. Heidelberg, 1856. Vol. I, page 279.

Frederick the Victorious, the beloved champion and hero of the Pfälzers. In other countries an infant sovereign and a prolonged regency are considered as a great calamity: in the Pfalz, however, under the powerful sway of the uncle of Philip, that country rose to greater prosperity, extent and influence than before. Frederick, on the death of his brother, was only twenty-four years, an age in which he had not yet had any opportunity of showing his extraordinary talents in war and government. He at once took the reins of the administration in his own hands and his sword sank heavily on the faithless Lützelsteiners and his treacherous cousin, the Count Palatine Lewis of Veldenz. He then called together, for the first time, the States general of the Pfalz in Oppenheim,* 1450, and shortly afterwards the nobility and clergy in Heidelberg, where they, with the consent of the other counts palatine and the countess dowager, in the name of her infant son, committed the electoral dignity to Frederick during the minority of his nephew, and rendered him willing homage as their sovereign and liege lord. In such unruly times it was considered necessary to confer the absolute power to the bravest warrior of Germany. Yet so wretched was the condition of the empire and so fallen the dignity of its chief, that the new elector of the Palatinate did not even demand the sanction of the emperor Frederick III. In consequence of this slight, the inactive and sullen Austrian became exasperated; he refused the imperial approbation and called to arms the numerous enemies and envious neighbors of the "Usurper." Frederick the victorious, however, was a match for them all and showed himself worthy of his name. In the chivalrous battles at Pfeddersheim and Seckenheim, he prostrated his adversaries and after an active and benevolent reign, on his death, 1460, left the electorate enlarged and consolidated to his nephew, Philip I. The glorious reign of Frederick I, is the most brilliant period in the his-

* An old chronicler of the life and deeds of Frederic the Victorious, mentions the deputies in the General Assembly at Oppenheim as "der Pfalz Fürsten, Prelaten, Graven, Herren, Manschaft und Landschaft."

tory of the Palatinate; the frontiers were extended and new territories acquired by treaty and conquest. The counties of Sponheim and Lützenstein; Stromberg, Bockelheim, Pfeddersheim, Arnheim and other possessions on the Middle Rhine, with Boxberg and Schupf, were united with the Pfalz; forty townships or castles, were conquered, and thirty more acquired by inheritance or treaty. Thus the Palatinate at last formed a compact and well encircled state of the most fertile territories in Germany; they were by Frederick divided into eighteen bailiwicks under the administration of *vicedomes* or bailiffs, who at that time of insecurity and violence, were chosen among the bravest knights and feudatories, and held the military and civil jurisdiction over their district. This trust secured the attachment of the most powerful families of the palatine nobility, the Helmstatt, Neipperg, Sickingen, Walbrunn and others who gave their ready support to the elector in the hour of danger.

Philip I, the Sincere, was already in his thirty-eighth year, on the death of his uncle, to whom he had left the government with his free consent, and in whose army he had fought with distinction. And yet his character was entirely different from that of his predecessor. Philip had enjoyed an excellent education; he was fond of classical literature, and delighted in the retired life of the closet, and in the conversation with the learned. If his political activity was crowned with less brilliant results than that of his uncle, so, on the other hand, he was superior to him in the signal encouragement he gave to science and literature, and both those worthy princes thus met the spirit of a new era, which toward the middle of the fifteenth century, opened the path for religious and social reform. Philip was the first among the German rulers, who caught the new light of "revival," and with enthusiasm promoted that powerful movement of the mind, which everywhere began to manifest itself in its steady opposition to the mediæval mysticism in church and school. The whole European world was then on the start: the printing-press of Guttenberg already be-

gan to send forth the profound and elegant works of ancient Greece and Rome. Italy had long been the centre of civilization; its refined sovereigns and opulent cities contended for the glory of being the encouraging patrons of art and poetry. What the Medici, Nicolas V, and other learned popes were for Florence and Italy, Philip the Sincere became for the Palatinate and Germany, which yet, when compared to its southern neighbor, lay in cloudy darkness behind the Alps! The excellent prince had, therefore, a hard fought contest with his pedantic professors at Heidelberg. That University, as a younger daughter of the *Alma Mater* of Paris, supported with virulence the Nominalistic party in the great scholastic battle of the age. Already the Elector Frederick I, had placed several professors in the Faculty of philosophy, who as champions of the more liberal doctrines of the opponent Realists had attempted to put a check to the spirit of guilds, ceremonies and narrow minded views—*Buchstaben-glauben*—which still refused to make any concessions to the more enlightened ideas of the time. The controversy was at its height, when men of liberal and profound learning, such as John Dalberg (afterward Bishop of Worms), Rudolph Agricola of Gröningen, and Conrad Celtes of Schweinfurt in Franconia, made their appearance at the court of Philip, and by their public lectures and writings contributed much to the ultimate victory of the Humanists and the reforms of the University. It was then that the literary society of the Rhine—*die Rheinische Gesellschaft*—was formed; nay, the corypheus of the philologists, John Reuchlin of Pforzheim in the Palatinate, on his visit to the elector in 1496, even succeeded in getting the students of the Heidelberg University to represent his satirical comedy, *Progymnasmata scenica*, which in the witty style and pure language of Terentius lashed severely the hypocritic monks and pettifogging lawyers of the day. The disputations about “the Holy Virgin” between the secular preachers and the Franciscan monks in Heidelberg, became so violent in 1501, that the students of the University were prohibited to attend them.

The excitement in the minds was continually increasing—until sixteen years later Luther spoke the word of truth! Social life was yet without refinement; hunting, banqueting and equestrian tournaments were the only distractions of the princes and nobility. Money was so scarce that the great Reuchlin as imperial councillor and “whipping-master” of the young palatine princes, received in yearly pay only a silken gown and one hundred florins; yet a marvellous change was impending.

It seems astonishing that a prince of such prudence and moderation as Philip the Sincere, who during thirty years of peace and prosperity had succeeded in transforming the Rheinpfalz into the most flourishing state of Germany, should now all at once, in his mature age (1503-1507) from a mere desire of agrandizement and vain illusion of obtaining a Bavarian inheritance by force of arms, draw all the evils of war and dismemberment on his happy country.

The duchy of Bavaria was then divided between two lines of the younger Wittelsbach dynasty: Albert of Upper Bavaria or *Bayern-München*, and George of Lower Bavaria or *Bayern Landshut*. The latter being rich, without male heirs, and as usual, in hostile relations to his cousin of München, desired to transfer the sovereignty of his duchy to the Palatine line, to whom he had united himself by the closest alliance of friendship and marriage. The wife of Philip was his sister, and his only daughter, Elizabeth, he had married in 1499 to the third son of the elector, the generous and warlike Count Palatine Rupert, whom he placed in possession of part of the country before his death in 1503. Yet the haughty Albert of Bayern-München had nearer claims to the inheritance, and having secured the final decision of the Emperor Maximilian I, and the princes of the empire in his favor, by the cession of the best part of the disputed lands to *treacherous Austria* and by keeping the others warm with promises—the terrible war broke out in 1504. The young and rash Rupert relying on the treasure of his father-in-law and on his Bohemian aux-

iliaries, began the unequal contest and was declared in the ban of the empire. This roused the covetous princes, and never before had the Palatinate been beset by so many enemies at the same time. Philip could not abandon the cause of his son, and hoped in vain for the efficient support of Lewis XII of France. The imperial armies, Albert of Bavaria, and all the heirs and descendants of the old enemies, Baden, Würtemberg, Veldenz, Zweibrücken and Leiningen, whom the victorious Frederick so often had chased fleeing from the battle-field, now united to share the spoils of Pfalz; nay, even several neutrals, such as Brandenburg and the city of Nürnberg joined the league, as Aeschylus says :

—οὐτε σύγγενοι
βροτοῖς τοι πεσούτα λαχτεῖαι πλεον!

for "when the oak falls there is wood for all." And to increase the horror still more, it was a civil war between kindred lines and—Wittelsbachers! Only Bohemia, Würzburg and the landgrave of Leuchtenberg remained faithful allies and the splendid Rupert, at the head of his Bohemians, took so signal a revenge on the Austrians, that Landshut opened its gates. Bretten and Caub defended themselves heroically and the barbarous Hessians, after a devastating inroad in the beautiful regions of the Bergstrasse, where they destroyed more than three hundred towns and villages, were at last defeated, but retired laden with spoils and more than a thousand tuns of wine! Nor did Bavaria suffer less—and in the midst of all this misery, the young Rupert fell a victim to the pestilence, and his heroic wife, Elizabeth, soon followed him in the grave, leaving two princes, Ott' Henry and Philip, the unprotected heirs of the ambitious claims of their parents! The old elector who, surrounded by enemies, had bravely defended himself in Heidelberg, was now tired of the war and accepted the decision of the Emperor Maximilian, in the diet of Cologne in 1505, according to which the duchy of Lower Bavaria was awarded to Albert; but the small duchy of Neuburg on the Danube, together with the princely treas-

[April,

ures and private property of Duke George, were inherited by the young orphans, under the guardianship of their uncle, Count Palatine Frederick. The duchy of Neuburg was henceforth called the *Younger Palatinate*. The ducal line of Munich had gained the victory, and Bavaria had once more become united, but what sacrifices had this fratricidal war entailed! what immense indemnification of lands and treasure had not been made to the rapacious Austrian, and in what a wretched condition was the country itself, devastated and depopulated from one frontier to the other! Nor did the dangers of the elector end here. His enemies were still encamped in the heart of the Palatinate, and only the most painful concessions could save the state. Würtemberg acquired Weinsberg and Marbach, with Maulbronn and Heidenheim. The treacherous Count Palatine of Veldenz had recovered Landsberg and Moschel and kept them. Nürnberg, the imperial republic under the protection of Maximilian, had, with fire and sword, enriched herself in the neighboring lands of the Upper Palatinate and obtained Aldorf, Hohenstein, the monastery of Engelthal and other districts. Hessa was indemnified on the Rhine with Homburg, Schönberg, Stein; though it did not afterward get into entire possession, while the old emperor, with Austrian tenacity, kept his conquests in Alsace. The elector, thus closely beset, refused the ratification of the peace; he remained during his life time in the ban of the empire, and it was not until 1512 that peace was made with Würtemberg, and 1521 with Hessa. Terrible as this war had been to Philip, the after woes of it were not the less so. This mild and pacific prince had become so indebted and was in such a want of the necessary means for carrying on his administration, that during the following years he was obliged to mortgage or sell many of his most precious possessions to the neighboring bishops and nobles. Thus part of the county of Sponheim was mortgaged to the cousins in Simmern; Weingarten and Neuenburg to Baden; Ladenburg came to Worms, other districts to Spire or Mayence, and Sinsheim to the lords of Gem-

mingen. The old elector, borne down with sorrow and sickness, had even the mortification that the emperor on the diet of Constance transferred to Saxony the Vicariate of the empire. Philip the Sincere, protested in vain, and died in Germersheim on the 28th February, 1508; ten days after, his enemy, Albert IV, of Bavaria followed him in the grave. Philip was the father of a numerous family, nine sons and five daughters. Lewis and Frederick followed him in the electorate. Rupert had died during the war of succession; the others either died early or became ecclesiastic dignitaries—and after fifty years the whole family was extinct.

We are now at the close of the middle ages, and the reign of the Elector Lewis V (1508–1544) falls in the time of the most stirring and important events of our modern era—the reformation of the Church by Martin Luther and the accession of Charles V to the imperial throne of Germany.

The sudden change of sovereign in the Palatinate was a relief to that unhappy country, as the conciliating politics of the new elector soon succeeded in the complete restoration of peace and the reconciliation with the emperor. Lewis was thirty years of age, chivalrous in his bearing, prudent and vigilant; he and his brother Frederick had been educated at the court of France. Yet his position was extremely difficult; some of the best provinces were lost or mortgaged without any prospect of being redeemed; the country had been laid waste by the war; money was wanting, the treasury empty and the dukes of Bavaria full of pride at their late success, were watching the opportunity for depriving their Palatinate cousins of the electoral dignity—nor did the Wittelsbach furies rest until this act of injustice was at last consummated in 1623.

Lewis V, however, made advances to Würtemberg and Bavaria and at his marriage with Sibylla, the daughter of Albert, all rancor seemed forgotten at the glittering nuptials in Heidelberg, 1511. From the emperor Lewis he not only obtained the investiture with the Palatinate according to that ancient formality, but the vicariate of the em-

pire was likewise restored to him in 1518, a few months before the death of Maximilian I (12th Jan. 1519), an event which at once placed Lewis at the head of the imperial administration during the interregnum.

The candidates were Francis I, King of France, and Don Carlos of Spain-Burgundy, the grandson of Maximilian. Both rivals sent their ambassadors to Germany and distributed immense sums to secure the votes of the electors and the favor of the princes. It appeared at first that Francis would succeed. Lewis, the Elector Palatine, with other Electors, leaned toward France, and no doubt were handsomely paid. But soon Charles of Spain, with the wealth of the New World at his disposal, carried all before him, and Lewis having received 120,000 hard florins and golden promises for himself and his brother Frederick, threw his influence in the scale of Charles V, who was elected in Mayence, 28th June, 1519. Frederick brought the joyful news to Castile, and was awarded with part of the imperial Governorship of Germany, which Charles V divided between the Count Palatine and his own brother Ferdinand of Austria. The general peace and the friendly relations with the emperor, seemed to secure a quiet reign to Lewis V. But the great religious movement had already begun at Wittenberg in Saxony, and it speedily extended to the Palatinate. Martin Luther, accompanied by Staupitz, came to Heidelberg in 1518 where his brilliant disputation in the church of the Augnstines before a numerous assembly of professors, students, monks and people of all classes, excited the highest enthusiasm and contributed powerfully to diffusion of the new doctrines. The elector himself was a man of a quiet meditative mind, open to the truth, though adverse to all violent persecutions, which he proved on the celebrated diet at Worms, 1521, where it was on account of *his* manly and decisive opposition to all violence that Luther did not share the fate of Hus at Constance. But the general call for religious liberty and independence, proclaimed by Luther, soon took a dangerous political tendency, which was heightened by the fermenta-

tion of the minds and the writings of Ulric von Hutten, and other champions of constitutional reforms. It was the feudal nobility itself that began to plot against their sovereign princes, and when the brave knight Francis of Sickingen in the Palatinate, was the first to draw the sword against the Archbishop of Treves in defence of the doctrine of Luther, the elector, though unwilling, felt himself obliged to proclaim the ban of the empire against his faithful ally and feudatory. In alliance with the Landgrave of Hesse and the Archbishop of Mayence he besieged the old Lion, the last RITTER, in his strong castle at Landstuhl, near Lautern, in 1523. The artillery soon battered down towers and bulwarks; the castle surrendered and the gallant Sickingen, wounded and a prisoner, expired in the presence of his admiring enemies.* More dangerous was the revolt of the peasantry on the Danube and Rhine, and it was only after the greatest exertions of the princes, secular and ecclesiastic, of central Germany, that tranquillity could be restored. The Palatinate thus became again the scene of fearful devastation during the year 1524 and 1525. Castles, churches, monasteries were burnt, and villages depopulated, until the peaceful Lewis was forced to lead his feudal army against his own subjects. They suffered a bloody defeat at Pfeddersheim, where the archbishop of Treves, at the head of his knights, rode furiously among the fleeing boors and killed a number with his own hand, while the more humane Lewis strenuously exerted himself to stop the slaughter. Of the prisoners, several were executed as ringleaders, and the citizens of Freinsheim, Neustadt and Weissenberg lost their artillery, their privileges and paid heavy contributions.

Everywhere in the Palatinate, Franconia and Thuringia, the most dreadful punishment was inflicted by the conquerors upon the revolted peasantry and all the disaffected who had taken a share in the revolutionary scenes, and revolting cruelties were perpetrated. Nay,

* Häusser's *Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz*. Heidelberg, 1856. Vol. I, page 520.

almost all the princes took advantage of this opportunity to rivet the chains of the vanquished. Only Elector Lewis the Pacific, was too humane and wise to follow their example : this excellent prince, by alleviating the burdens of his peasants and by administering supplies to their comfort and the education of their children, prevented similar movements for the future. To accomplish this on a larger scale, he called together the assembly of the counts and knights of his states in Heidelberg on the 26th of September, where decisive measures were taken and promises of alleviation were given, though the nobility refused to suppress the tithe ; it was likewise proposed that though rebellious preachers were to be punished, no hindrance would be laid to the free preaching of the pure Gospel.

Lewis, occupied with these ameliorations at home and the embellishments of the Castle at Heidelberg, took no farther part in the progress of reformation in Germany. He remained aloof as mediator, without pronouncing either for the Catholic or Protestant party. He permitted the new doctrine to develop itself in his states, though he did not promote its interest, and he remained an adherent of the old Church, without becoming the champion of Romish influence in Germany. Henry VIII of England, wrote a pressing exhortation to him "to extinguish the poisonous pestilence of the reformation," which the elector left unanswered ; nor had the earnest letters of Pope Hadrian VI to the University of Heidelberg, to hold fast to the faith of Rome more success than the capuchinade of the British despot to the elector. In the mean time the reformation had already taken a firm footing in different parts of the electorate and principally in the Upper Palatinate and the duchy of Neuburg, under the protection of its zealous promoter the Duke Ott' Henry. It began early to extend in the Kraich-Gau, where the concentrated power of the nobility offered it their open protection. Thus the doctrines of Luther were preached in 1522 in Bretten, the birth place of the celebrated Reformer Melancthon, in Wimpfen, Gemmingen, Fürfeld, Eppingen,

Sonnenfeld and Neckarbischofsheim and the active exertions of a Schnepf, Gallus, Irenicus, Ebermann, Rave and other reformers, met with no hindrance from Lewis the Pacific. Beyond the Rhine, Francis of Sickingen, with the assistance of the eloquent Oecolampadius, Bucer, Aquila and Schwebel had already introduced the reform in the West, and the collateral Palatine lines of Zweibrücken and Veldenz were declared adherents of Luther. Everywhere the mass and other Romish rites were abolished and the new Lutheran doctrine and church service introduced.

The great religious war, however, was impending, but Lewis did not live to see its outbreak. He died childless in 1544 and left the succession in the electorate to his brother Frederic II. This chivalric and adventurous prince, now sixty years of age, had been the friend and courtier of the Emperor Charles V. He was too much a man of the world to be a zealous Catholic, though he had at the celebrated diet of Augsburg in 1530, as imperial commissioner, taken a hostile stand against the Protestants. He had spent his life in travels and embassies, escaping with difficulty from the spies of the Inquisition in Spain, and after many frustrated hopes, had married a Danish princess, the daughter of the exiled King Christian II of Denmark.*

On ascending to the electoral dignity the position of Frederic II had become very difficult. He obtained the investiture of the Pfalz only through the favor of the emperor because the regular succession would have passed to his nephew, Ott' Henry of Neuburg, as the son of his elder

*The life and adventures of the Count Palatine Frederic have been written and published by his secretary Hubertus Thomas, and give a lively description of the social and political condition of Europe at that time. It is particularly interesting to follow the German Prince and his suite to Spain, and there behold the desolation, poverty and squalid misery of preud Castile, at home smarting under the double scourge of an absolute king and a blood-thirsty inquisition, while her victorious armies abroad attempted to conquer the world! Such was the condition of that unhappy country during its most brilliant era! and when we now compare the itinerary of Hubertus in 1526 with that of the honest Nürnberg Doctor Tetzl from 1466—of which I gave a sketch in my *World of the Middle Ages*, Vol. II, p. 730, 8 vo. Edition—must we not feel some doubt at the impartiality and truthfulness of modern Historians who in their pompous works throw a veil over all these horrors and give us a wrong side of the picture.

[April,

brother Rupert, who perished during the Bavarian war. This prince, a very zealous Lutheran, was highly beloved by the Pfälzers, who feared that their new Catholic Elector at the threatening war might take part with Pope and Emperor and bring an awful reaction over the country. But Frederick was too prudent to throw himself into the vortex. As an independent prince he at once changed his politics; he felt jealous of the Habsburg power and secretly allied himself with France against Charles V, during the Spanish invasion of Champagne in 1544. Nay, he even went a step farther, and after the advice of Melanchthon recognized himself publicly the complete reform of the Church. Thus on the 3rd of January, 1546, the protestant church service was solemnly held in the Cathedral of the Holy Spirit and the Lord's Supper served in both forms, to the intense delight of the people. The immense step was now taken and the Palatine troops under their purple banner joined the army of the Smalkaldian confederacy in the war against the emperor. Yet the victory of Charles at Mühlberg in 1547, soon decided the ruin of the Protestant princes, and Spanish troops occupying Boxberg, threatened the Palatinate. Frederic was forced to yield and when Charles V in 1548 visited Heidelberg he made the old elector give the promise that he would restore the Romish Church according to the imperial decision of the Augsburg *Interim*. The zealous Duke of Neuburg, Ott' Henry, had, during the feud, been expelled from his country, and lived now as an exile in Heidelberg; but Frederick being himself indifferent about religious opinions, old and weary of the vicissitudes of life, obeyed the injunctions of the haughty Spaniard. From the Heidelberg Castle he sent forth his orders, without caring, however, whether they were executed; nay, the Lutheran feeling remained so powerful that even in Heidelberg the Professor Anton Schnor of Antwerp was permitted to represent a satyric drama in his house, in which Persecuted Religion (*Eusebeia*) having been expelled by kings and princes, finds a happy home in the cottage of the poor villagers. Such was the curious position of

affairs in 1549. Three years later, in 1552, Maurice of Saxony, with his Lutheran army, pressed forward to Innspruck; the emperor fled across the Alps; France invaded Alsace and the peace of Passau, secured all the fruits of the victorious Reformation.

Old Frederick II stood now on the brink of the grave. By flatterers, but not by historians, he is called the Wise. This by-name sounds like a satire, because though he was a perfect knight and courtier, and a traveller, speaking several languages, and well acquainted with the affairs of the world, he had never developed any solid talents nor obtained any profound learning; while his profusion and extravagance, throughout life, had brought him in endless debts, embarrassments and distress. He was fond of building magnificent castles, hunting lodges and palaces, which he left fall to ruin again. His fêtes, banquets—*Trinkgelagen*—tournaments and other equestrian and military performances were the most splendid in Germany, and brought noble visitors to Heidelberg from all corners of Europe. Yet we dwell with particular pleasure on the able reforms he undertook at the Heidelberg University, which at last during his reign emerging from the scholastic bigotry of the middle ages, now hailed the genial light of a purer faith and reformed system of instruction, with a more thorough and tasteful development of classical studies. An efficient *paedagogium* or teachers' school was established and the increased library soon became the most precious in Germany. The pecuniary means for these useful reforms were found in the secularization of rich monasteries and convents. Frederic called distinguished philologists and mathematicians to the chairs, such as Jacob Curio, Nic. Cisner of Mosbach, Graff and the celebrated Jacob Micellus; nay, even a remarkable lady, Signora Olympia Fulvia Morata from Ferrara, the admiration of Italy in classic accomplishments, filled a chair at Heidelberg University. In Italy it was nothing strange to see a lady at Bologna or Florence lecture to an audience of thousands of students, during the enthusiasm for classical literature in the fifteenth

century, and Italy has thus preceded the United States of America in the emancipation of the fair sex for five centuries. But in Germany a lady professor of a university—was considered as a non-plus-ultra. Most unhappily the young Signora was of delicate health and through change of climate and other misfortunes, died soon after in Heidelberg in 1555.

The death of Frederic II, 1556, and the succession of his nephew, Ott' Henry the Generous, Duke of Neuburg and Sulzbach, secured the Lutheran party in the Palatinate the prominent position which they occupied, though it was feared that the Bavarian duke and other Catholic princes would protest against the investiture of the Palatinate and the Vicariate of the empire being granted to a Protestant prince. Bavaria might thus have renewed her old claims and become a dangerous adversary. Ott' Henry had been in trouble with William, Duke of Bavaria ; he himself had drawn the sword against Charles V in 1546, had been expelled from his duchy and was, during his exile in Heidelberg, the most enthusiastic partisan of the Reformation. Yet in spite of all this he succeeded. The time was a remarkable one; Charles V, tired of the weight of his diadem and of his checkered life had laid down the sceptre, and his brother Ferdinand of Austria desired peace and votes for the imperial election. Thus no opposition was made by the Catholic princes, and the College of the Electors received another protestant member.

Immediately at his arrival on the Rhine in 1556 Ott' Henry proclaimed the final abrogation of all papistic errors and the complete establishment of the Evangelic faith. The new Church regulations, composed by Michael Diller, Stolo and Marbach, soon appeared in the severest Lutheran form. The entire hierarchy underwent a thorough reorganization ; with the princely power and oriental luxury of Bishops, Abbots and Abbesses, it was now at an end. The ecclesiastical Synod was composed of members of the University of Heidelberg, among whom were the distinguished professors Ch. Ehem, Thomas Erast and Michael

Diller. The different degrees of ministers in the new Church were pastors, deacons and superintendents: at the head of the whole Church establishment stood a general superintendent. The Elector Ott' Henry was a liberal minded man of the kindest disposition. He attempted to convert the phantastical Anabaptists by means of a religious disputation at Pfeddersheim in 1557, and when he did not succeed, he still permitted them to live quietly in the country. The same moderation he showed toward other dissenters, and at Frankfort in 1558 he proposed to the assembled princes and signed himself a creed of faith in so moderate a form that without diverging too far from the severe Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, it might yet be accepted by the rest of the Protestants. Even in his nearer intercourse he avoided all that might cause a clashing. He thus preserved peace, but he had hardly closed his eyes in death when that theological controversy began, the progress of which, during the reign of his successor, caused a total revolution in the ecclesiastic relations of the Palatinate.

With Ott' Henry, who died childless on the 12th of February, 1559, terminated the elder palatine line of Lewis III., son of the Emperor Rupert III. According to the family convention, he was followed by the Count Palatine John II of Simmern, the ancestor of the younger electoral dynasty.

We have thus brought the history of the Rhenish Palatinate to the close of the Middle Ages and the extinction of the elder Wittelsbach Dynasty. In our next, and last article, we shall enter upon the more interesting events of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries until the incorporation of the Electoral States with the Kingdom of Bavaria.

A. L. K.

Franklin and Marshall College.
February 14, 1859.

ART. VII.—CALVIN'S ORDER OF HOLY BAPTISM,

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN OF THE GENEVA CATECHISM.

THE Sacrament of Baptism being a subject which is at present discussed with earnestness by the periodical press, in books, and more or less in the pulpit also ; and as entire branches of the Protestant Church will no doubt soon be led to review prevailing superficial, not to say rationalistic, theories ; it is a matter of serious interest to all thinking minds to know definitely the views of the pious and learned men, by whom divine Providence inaugurated the Protestant form of the development of the Church ; and of none of them is it less so than of John Calvin, the principal organ of the Reformed Confessions. On this point the *Institutes* are indeed satisfactory ; but as the work combats the errors both of Romanism and rationalism, of scepticism and radicalism, passages may be found which are in apparent conflict with the sound scriptural view of Baptism which Calvin evidently held. To such misconception, however, the Order for the solemn administration of the Sacrament, prepared by him, is less exposed ; and we may safely refer to it, as giving free, full and unequivocal expression to his views concerning the efficacy, or objective force, of the ordinance.

The following translation, furnished by one of our contributors, is a faithful rendering of the entire office, including rubrics, as contained in the Geneva Catechism. The original Latin may be found in the *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae*, edited by Dr. Herm. Adalb. Daniel, Vol. III. p. 114—120. A good translation into German, though not complete, may also be found in Ebrard's *Reformirtes Kirchenbuch*, p. 162—166.—ED.

ORDER OF HOLY BAPTISM.

Inasmuch as baptism is a solemn adoption into the Church of Jesus Christ, it should be administered to infants either at the time of catechization on the Lord's day, or on any other day, in the presence of the whole congregation.

After the sermon, the child shall be presented. Then the officiating minister shall say :

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth. Amen.

Do you bring this child here to be baptized ?

Answer. We do.

Minister. Our Lord teaches us in what great misery and corruption we are born, when He says we must be born again. For if our nature must needs be renewed, in order that we may enter the kingdom of God, it is clear that that nature is deeply corrupt and hateful in His eyes. Hence He exhorts us to humble ourselves, and lament and abhor our vileness. And thus He prepares us to desire and obtain from Him that grace by which the perversity and unworthiness of our original nature may be extinguished and thoroughly destroyed. For there is no room for Him in us, until we abandon all confidence in our own virtue, righteousness and wisdom, and acknowledge our total depravity.

But when the Lord has made known to us our misery and corruption, He comforts us in His abundant mercy, promising to raise us up by his Holy Spirit to a new life, which shall be to us an entrance, as it were, into His kingdom. To this regeneration belong two things ; first, that we renounce our own selves and no longer live according to our own reason or will or natural desires, but submit rather in heart and soul to the Divine wisdom and righteousness, mortifying the flesh with the affections and the lusts thereof ; second, that we follow the light of God and obey His most holy will, as He teaches us in His Word and enlightens us and points out the way for us by His Holy Spirit. But both these are fulfilled and perfected in our Lord Jesus Christ ; for whoever has part in His *death*, is dead and buried with Him to sin. Hence it is that we are raised by the power of His *resurrection* to a new life, which is from God, since His Spirit guides and rules us and works in us whatsoever is pleasing in His sight. Yet the main source of our salvation is this, that, on account

of His mercy, He pardons all our sins and does not impute them to us, but so blots out the very remembrance of them, that they shall never appear in judgment against us.

All these benefits become ours, as soon as we are engrafted into the body of the Church by baptism; for in this sacrament the Lord testifies *the remission of our sins*. To this end he ordained water as a sign and symbol, to show most clearly, that, as the stains of the body are washed away by this element, He will in the same manner so purge our souls, that no spot or blemish shall any longer appear. Moreover, He thus bestows upon us, that *renovation*, which, as we have before said, consists in the mortification of the flesh and the spiritual life, which He begets and creates within us. Thus we receive from God a two fold blessing in baptism, provided we do not destroy the virtue of this sacrament by neglect and ingratitude. For in it we have the most certain pledge, that God will be to us a gracious Father, not imputing unto us our trespasses, and also that He will ever abide in us by His Holy Spirit, to enable us to fight against the Devil, sin and the desires of the flesh, until we attain the victory and enjoy the liberty of His kingdom, which is a kingdom of righteousness.

Since, therefore, these two things are accomplished in us by the grace of Jesus Christ, it is evident that the truth and substance of baptism are comprehended and included in Him; for we have no other laver but his blood; no other renovation, but in his death and resurrection. In the same manner as he communicates to us His rich blessings through the word, He freely bestows them also through the sacraments.

But our most merciful and gracious God, not content with adopting us into His family and admitting us into the communion of His Church, shows the riches of His grace in a still more glorious manner, by promising to be the God also of our *children and children's children* unto the thousandth generation. Wherefore, although they are descended from the corrupt race of Adam, He admits them to Himself, by reason of the covenant, which He has made

with their parents, and counts them as *His own* children ; for which cause, in the very beginning of the Church, He commanded the seal of circumcision to be imprinted upon infants, by which He then signified and declared all that is now represented in holy baptism. And as he ordered them to be circumcised, so He numbered them among His children, and was no less their Father than the Father of those, by whom they were begotten.

And now since the Lord Jesus came down to earth not to diminish the grace of God the Father, but to extend rather to the ends of the earth that covenant of salvation, which till then was confined to the Jewish people, there can be no doubt but that *our* children also are heirs of His life, and the salvation, which He has promised to us ; hence Paul declares, that they are sanctified from the mother's womb and distinguished thus from the children of heathen and unbelievers. Hence also, our Lord Jesus Christ suffered little children to be brought to Him, as we read in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew : "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray ; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children and forbid them not, to come unto me ; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Since then He assures us, that theirs is the kingdom of heaven, and lays his hands on them and commends them to His Father, it is very clear, that we should not exclude them from His Church. Following therefore His rule and command, we will admit this child into His Church, that it may become a partaker of all those blessings, which He has promised to His faithful ones. But, first of all, let us offer it to the Lord in prayer, with humble and devout supplication :

Lord God, almighty and eternal Father ! Because in Thine infinite mercy, Thou hast promised to be our God and the God of our children, deign to confirm this Thy blessing unto this child of Christian parents. And as we offer and consecrate it to Thee, do thou receive it into Thy guardian care, show Thyself its God and Saviour, pardon

and remit its original sin, the guilt of which rests upon the whole race of Adam, and furthermore, sanctify it by Thy Spirit, that when it has reached the age of discretion and understanding, it may acknowledge and worship Thee as its only God and Saviour, give Thee praise and honor through the whole course of life, and always obtain from Thee the forgiveness of its sins. But that it may truly receive these blessings, do Thou admit it into the communion of our Lord Jesus, so as to partake, as a member of His body, of all His benefits. Hearken unto us, Father of mercies, that this baptism, which we here perform at Thy command, may have the effect promised in the teachings of Thy Gospel.

OUR Father who art in heaven, Hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

As this child is now to be admitted into the Christian Church, you will pledge yourselves, when it comes to years of understanding, to instruct it in the doctrine, which is received and approved by the people of God, as it is briefly and summarily comprehended in that confession of faith, which we all hold :

I BELIEVE in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :

And in Jesus Christ His only begotten Son our Lord ; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary ; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried ; He descended into hell ; the third day He rose from the dead ; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost ; the holy Catholic Church ; the communion of saints ; the remission of sins ; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. *Amen.*

You will pledge yourselves, therefore, to take all care that it be instructed in this doctrine, and in everything contained in the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, so that it may hear and receive it as the true word of God, sent down from heaven. Moreover, it shall be exhorted to order its life by that rule and precept, which God has given in His law, whose sum is: first, to love Him with all our soul, heart, and strength, and then, our neighbor as ourselves; and also to put faith in the preaching and admonitions, which God has delivered to us through His prophets and Apostles, to deny itself and all its carnal desires, and with jealous devotion to preach the name of Jesus Christ and edify its neighbors.

A promise being given, the child shall be named; then the minister shall pour water upon it, saying:

N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

All this shall be uttered with a clear voice and in a vernacular tongue, so that all who are present at the mystery, may understand what is done, and recalling to mind their own baptism, be confirmed more and more.

We are well aware, that in some places many other ceremonies are used, which have not come down to us from the most ancient times. And as they are the inventions of men, without any foundation in the Word of God, and have given rise to much superstition, they ought to be abolished, so as to hinder no one from coming to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is clear, that all things not commanded by God, are left to our own free will; whatever, therefore, does not tend to the promotion of faith should not be admitted into the Church, or if admitted, should be abolished; and the more so, if it be perverted to an idolatrous use.

There is no doubt, that candles, ointments (which are called *Chrisma*) and other things of the kind, were never prescribed by God, but introduced by men, and, in the gradual progress of superstition, have come to be valued and honored more than the institution of Christ itself. It cannot be denied, that we possess the form and substance of that baptism, which was ordained by Christ, followed by His Apostles and practiced by the ancient Church; and we cannot be blamed for not being willing to surpass God himself in wisdom.

ART. VIII.—ANGLO-LATIN HYMNS.

The Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, of New York, has kindly placed at our disposal some fine specimens of Anglicized medieval hymns, with the permission to publish them in this Review. We add the original Latin for the convenience of the readers who may not have access to it. The first is a translation of the choicest stanzas of St. Bernard's famous *Jubilus rhythmicus de nomine Jesu*, of the twelfth century. In its full length with all the additions of later authors, as given by Daniel, *Thesaurus hymnologicus I.* 227–230, it contains 192 lines; but the Roman Breviary has shortened and divided it into three distinct hymns: “*Jesu dulcis memoria*,” “*Jesu rex admirabilis*,” and “*Jesu decus angelicum*.” Another version of this sweet and lovely hymn, but less close than this, may be found in *Lyra Catholica*, p. 102. (N. York reprint, 1851), commencing thus:

Jesus! the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills my breast;
But sweeter far Thy face to see
And in Thy presence rest.

The best German reproduction of this hymn is Count Zinzendorf's: “*Jesu, deiner zu gedenken*.” A more recent German version is from the pen of Dr. J. A. Königsfeld in his *Latinische Hymnen und Gesänge*, p. 125.

The second specimen is an equally happy rendering of a beautiful and touching passion hymn of St. Bonaventura, of the thirteenth century. It may be interesting to the reader to compare this version with the one from the pen of one of the most faithful contributors to this Review, and published in the volume for 1858, p. 481.

P. S.

THE NAME OF JESUS.

I.

Jesu dulcis memoria
Dans vera cordi gaudia,
Sed super mel et omnia
Eius dulcis praesentia.

II.

Nil canitur suavius,
Nil auditur jucundius.
Nil cogitatur dulcissimus
Quam Jesus Dei filius.

I.

JESUS, how sweet thy memory is!
Thinking of Thee is truest bliss;
Beyond all honeyed sweets below
Thy presence is it here to know.

II.

Tongue cannot speak a lovelier word,
Nought more melodious can be heard,
Nought sweeter can be thought upon,
Than Jesus Christ, God's only Son.

III.

Jesu spes poenitentibus
Quam plus es potentibus
Quam bonus tu quaerentibus,
Sed quid in invententibus.

IV.

Jesu, dulcedo cordium,
Fons veri, lumen mentium,
Excedens omne gaudium.
Et omne desiderium.

V.

Mane nobiscum domine,
Et nos illustra lumine,
Pulsa noctis caligine
Mundum replens dulcedine.

VI.

Quando cor nostrum visitas,
Tunc lucet ei veritas,
Mundi vilescit vanitas
Et intus fervet caritas.

VII.

Amor Jesus dulcissimus
Et vere suavissimus,
Plus nullius gratissimus
Quam dicere sufficiuntur.

VIII.

Jesum omnes agnoscite
Jesum ardenter quaerite
Amorem ejus poscite
Quaerendo inardescite.

IX.

Tu fons misericordiae,
Tu verae lumen patriae
Pelle nubem tristitiae
Dans nobis lucem glorie.

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, died 1153.

III.

Jesus, thou hope of those who turn,
Gentle to those who pray and mourn,
Ever to those who seek thee, kind—
What must thou be to those who find

IV.

Jesus, thou dost true pleasures bring,
Light of the heart, and living spring;
Higher than highest pleasures roll,
Or warmest wishes of the soul.

V.

Lord in our bosoms ever dwell,
And of our souls the night dispel,
Pour on our inmost mind the ray,
And fill our earth with blissful day.

VI.

If thou dost enter to the heart,
Then shines the truth in every part,
All worldly vanities grow vile,
And charity burns bright the while.

VII.

This love of Jesus is most sweet,
This laud of Jesus is most meet, [dear,
Thousand and thousand times more
Than tongue of man can utter here.

VIII.

Praise Jesus, all with one accord,
Crave Jesus, all, your love and Lord
Seek Jesus, warmly, all below,
And seeking into rapture glow !

IX.

Thou art of heavenly grace the fount,
Thou art the true sun of God's mount
Scatter the saddening cloud of night
And pour upon us glorious light !

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.

THE CROSS OF JESUS.

I.

Recordare sanctae crucis,
Qui perfectam viam ducis
Delectare jugiter.
Sanctae crucis recordare,
Et in ipsa meditare
Insatibiliter.

I.

Jesus' holy Cross and dying
O remember! ever eyeing
Endless pleasure's pathway here;
At the Cross thy mindful station
Keep, and still in meditation
All unsated persevere.

II.

Quum quiescas aut laboras,
Quando rides, quando ploras,
Doles sive gaudeas;
Quando vadis, quando venis,
In solatii, in poenis
Crucem corde teneas.

III.

Crux in omnibus pressuris,
Et in gravibus et duris
Est totum remedium.
Crux in poenis et tormentis
Est dulcedo pine mentis,
Et verum refugium.

IV.

Crux est porta paradisi,
In qua sancti sunt confisi,
Qui viceerunt omnia.
Crux est mundi medicina,
Per quam bonitas divina
Facit mirabilia.

V.

Crux est salus animarum,
Verum lumen et praeclarum,
Et dulcedo cordium.
Crux est vita beatorum,
Et thesaurus perfectorum,
Et decor et gaudium.

VI.

Crux est speculum virtutis,
Gloriosae dux salutis,
Cuncta spes fidelium.
Crux est decus salvandorum,
Et solatium eorum
Atque desiderium.

VII.

Crux est arbor decorata,
Christi sanguine sacra,
Cunctis plena fructibus,
Quibus animae cruentur,
Cum supernis nutriantur
Cibis in coelestibus.

VIII.

Crucifixe! fac me fortorem,
Ut libenter tuam mortem
Pliangam. donec vixero.
Tecum volo vulnerari,
Te libenter amplaxari
In cruce desidero.

II.

When thou toildest, when thou sleepest,
When thou smildest, when thou weepest,
Or in mirth, or woe, hast part:
When thou comest, when thou goest,
Grief or consolation shewest,
Hold the Cross within thy heart.

III.

'Tis the Cross, when comforts languish,
In the heaviest hour of anguish,
Makes the broken spirit whole;
When the pains are most tormenting,
Sweetly here the heart relenting
Finds the refuge of the soul.

IV.

Christ's Cross is the gate of heaven,
Trust to all disciples given,
Who have conquered all their foes;
Christ's Cross is the people's healing,
Heavenly goodness o'er it stealing
In a stream of wonders flows.

V.

'Tis the cure of soul-diseases, [es],
Truth that guides, and light that pleases:
Sweetness in the heart's distress :
Life of souls in heavenly pleasure,
And of raptured saints the treasure,
Ornament and blissfulness.

VI.

Jesus' Cross is virtue's mirror,
Guide to safety out of error,
True believers' single rest ;
Crown of Pilgrims unto heaven,
Solace to the weary given,
Longed for by the humble breast.

VII.

Jesus' Cross, the tree once scorned,
All with crimson drops adorned,
Laden hangs with rich supplies ;
These the souls from death are leading,
Who, with heavenly spirits feeding,
Taste the manna of the skies.

VIII.

Crucified! Thy strength supplying,
Let me, till my day of dying,
Gaze upon Thy dying face !
Yea, thy deepest wounds desiring,
Thee, though on the Cross expiring,
Ever pant I to embrace.

ART. IX.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A NEW HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO, by *Robert A. Wilson*, Counsellor at Law, etc. Philadelphia : James Challen & Son. New York : Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston : Crosby, Nichols & Co. Pittsburg : W. S. Rentoul. 8 vo. pp. 539.

Historical criticism has made some wonderful changes necessary in this department of the literature of the past ages. Since the Reformation it has had free scope, at least in Protestant countries, and has also invaded the records of those lands, where ecclesiastical censorship to the ninth degree, as in the case of the Spanish Inquisition, made history to suit the times. History and Romance were formerly so mingled indiscriminately, that fact and fiction were often undistinguishable. Some have asserted that the one is as true as the other. It has even passed into a saw, which declares that History has nothing true in it but real names, while all but the names is true in fable and Romance. A corrupt censorship in the service and under the control of marvellous loving monks, could make anything a history, and history of anything, invented by their caprice, or credulous superstition for the real or supposed benefit of their Church. So at least our author asserts ; the histories of the Conquest of Mexico were first made, and all subsequent ones, even down to Prescott, are drawn from the same incorrect sources.

Years ago we read with youthful enthusiasm and admiration Prescott's great History of the Conquest by Cortez. The peculiar fascinations thrown around the wonderful narrative, invest it with all the charms of Romance. We rejoiced that history could be made as attractive as fiction. It was not without some feeling of regret, therefore, that we heard of Wilson's New History of the Conquest of Mexico, which shows that after all we have had only a historical romance founded on fact, rather than the fact of history itself. Prescott's great genius, it is true, made the most of it as he found its materials. But starting with the mythical records of Spanish Traditions, as a basis, he could give us little more than the fabulous creations of Spanish monks, who only were authorized to write the first history under the license of the Inquisition.

It did, however, seem to savor of skepticism and irreverence for the old authorities and traditions of history, for Judge Wilson to set these aside as unworthy of confidence, and then

construct a new plan of a real History of the Conquest of Mexico. It breaks up all our previous conceptions and gives us a *New History*. It was doubtless a bold venture to attempt a radical revolution in this particular department of History. And yet, with the concurrent opinions of Albert Gallatin, and Secretary Cass, men who are fitted to judge by a thorough study of the question, added to our author's own acute observation during his travels and sojourn in that country itself, he fearlessly sets aside "whatever was manifestly untrue" in what has formerly been written.

The Aztecs were Indians, not Jews. Montezuma was only an Indian chief, far removed from the royal dignity and luxury of a Moorish Emperor. The vestiges of ancient civilization he traces to Egyptian and Phoenician origin. Picture writing, of which so much account has been made, he denounces as a monkish imposition, to give authority to their absurd traditions. The miraculous "interpositions of the blessed Virgin and the Saints" are given by those Spanish historians to glorify their Church. In fact the chief staple in their history of the Aztecs were "the devil, the children of Israel, and the Jews."

Our author is of the opinion, that St. Thomas, the Apostle, never visited America; that the woman and child, whose image is inscribed on some of the ruins, is not the Virgin and the Infant Jesus, but the infant sacrifice of Ashtoreth; that the Palenque Cross, is that of the Phoenician coins.

Our prejudices, if we have had any, fall away, or melt before the rays of truth, as we read on, while our author interests us more and more with actual facts, instead of fancy colored fiction. What he writes, thus necessarily becomes emphatically a New History of the Conquest of Mexico.

R.

PALESTINE, PAST AND PRESENT, by Rev. S. H. Osborn, A. M.
 Philadelphia : James Challen & Son. Boston : Philips, Sampson & Co. New York : Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Pittsburg : W. S. Rentoul, 8 vo. pp. 600.

Helps to the better understanding of the Bible, are always welcomed by the lovers of Christian truth. In our day, works on the Holy Land have greatly multiplied in number and increased in interest. Formerly these were beyond the reach of the ordinary student, and without them much of the written word of God was a sealed book. It is now a great pleasure, as well as profit, to enjoy the benefits of others' labor in the travels and researches in Palestine. Thus we are introduced to the

history, manners, customs, products, and main characteristics of the Bible Lands. New light is often brought to bear on dark points.

Prof. Osborn now takes a place among the many illustrious writers, who have traveled in the holy land. His book is a valuable contribution to the literature auxiliary to Biblical studies. In the department of the Natural Sciences, especially, to which the author has devoted himself, we find in his new work, many interesting hints and observations. The Geology of the country, its soil, rocks, hills and plains receive much attention. The Natural History, too, of the land, its animals, birds, insects and reptiles; and the vegetable products, plants, trees, fruits and grains, he so treats of in a scientific way as to add new and clearer meaning to the Scriptures in which reference is made to them.

In many places in the book the Professor is perhaps disposed to parade his scientific acumen pedantically in notes and strained observations. It would almost seem that he went for the express purpose of making a book. He provided himself in the outset with instruments to take bearings and measurements and sketches; also with guide books for references: so that his book is not the result of accident or circumstance, but rather of a matured plan.

Palestine, Past and Present, is withal a beautiful book, magnificently illustrated, and contains also a new map of the country. It has not suffered in the hands of the publishers, Messrs. Challen & Son. In their usual style of superior excellence, they have brought out the book in a garb which would dress with artistic respectability a much less deserving work. They publish in uniform style with this, the new History of the Conquest of Mexico, and The City of the Great King.

R.

INFANT SALVATION IN ITS RELATION TO INFANT DEPRAVITY, INFANT REGENERATION AND INFANT BAPTISM. By J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., Pastor of the Race Street Evangelical Reformed church, Philadelphia. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859. 12 mo. pp. 192.

The duty and significance of Infant Baptism is engaging the earnest consideration of the different branches of the Protestant Church. The sacrament itself has indeed been a part of the professed faith of the Church in every period of her past history, and no less so since the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century than it was before; but whilst the Baptists deny the right to it of the great majority of the human race, the

larger number of Pedobaptists, especially in America, though not excluding from it the most helpless and needy, have divested it of all saving spiritual efficacy—of all efficacious operation as a means of grace. Thus one party exclude the great mass of mankind from the use of the ordinance appointed of God for the putting on of Christ, (Gal. 3 : 27) in order to extend salvation the more rapidly and generally; and the other, reducing it to a hollow, outward form, administer the ineffectual form to both young and old, as being most conducive to the promotion of spiritual Christianity.

The attractive little volume by Doctor Bomberger on Infant Salvation and Infant Baptism, is but one of many indications of growing dissatisfaction with prevailing narrow and superficial views. Christian consciousness demands something more than a form or mere ceremony; and parental affection, deepened and sanctified by the grace of Christ, can not be reconciled to the exclusion of helpless little children from the blessings of the Gospel. This earnest practical discussion will, therefore, call forth a warm response in many Christian hearts.

The author discusses the following topics: 1. Infant Depravity, 2. The Necessity of Infant Regeneration, 3. Infant Salvation, and 4. Infant Baptism. About one half of the volume is devoted to the third topic—*Infant Salvation*. The argument is thus summed up: “Wherefore taking all these things together,—remembering how much richer are the provisions of the Better Covenant than those of the former dispensation,—keeping in view the Saviour’s treatment of little children, and His declaration concerning them,—adding to this the import of the promise announced by Peter on the day of Pentecost,—the argument of Paul in Rom. 5 : 18, 19, and in 1 Cor. 15 : 22,—and the plainly revealed purpose of the day of judgment, and, in a word, considering the general tenor of the entire Gospel of Jesus Christ—tell me, “if Christianity does not throw a pleasant radiance around an infant tomb.” p. 147.

On the relation of Infant Baptism to Infant Salvation, we quote the following: “By nature children are depraved and under condemnation. The only way of their deliverance from this sad natural state is through regeneration. This is provided for them, and guarantied to them through the atonement of Jesus Christ, which extends to their salvation from the curse of Adam’s sin. Therefore they should receive the appointed sign and seal of that salvation, *they should be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*”

“This must be allowed to follow as an unavoidable conclusion from the entire preceding argument. If children are depraved and need the renewal of their nature to qualify them for heaven; if children are susceptible of such renewing grace by the operation of the Holy Ghost making them new creatures

in Christ Jesus; if the blessed Saviour Himself receives them as His; by what consideration can we refuse them the Sacrament of the formal confession of their spiritual need, and of the formal confirmation of these blessings, here on earth? If we think we have sufficient ground to believe that in case of their early death they would be admitted to fellowship with the saints in the Church above, which is without blemish, with what show of reason or religion can we justify any present exclusion of them, from formal fellowship in the Church below, whose beauty is marred with so many spots? The Bridegroom does not disown them. Will a vain and haughty bride affect such sanctity as to let them lie, on account of their natural uncleanness, unrecognized and spurned at her door? Pharaoh's daughter showed a kinder heart than this.

"But why, if children dying in infancy will certainly be saved, whether baptized or not, why have them baptized at all? This question I know will be asked. And it can be answered, too, most satisfactorily answered for all who are willing to give the replies a candid consideration." pp. 131-153.

Circumcision, the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant, was the appointed means by which the children of the Jews were received into the covenant, and enjoyed all its temporal and spiritual blessings. By the same solemn rite proselytes with their children were admitted to the privileges of Jews. But all who were not circumcised were excluded from the blessings of the covenant. As the sacrament of holy Baptism in the new dispensation corresponds to circumcision in the old, it occupies a similar relative position. It is the ordinance of Christ by which persons, whether adults or infants, are introduced into the covenant of grace, and become members of the Christian Church.

We should, therefore, be disposed to argue, not from the fact of infant salvation as a direct result of the atonement to the duty of infant Baptism, but from the fact of infants having been received into the covenant of grace by Baptism to the certainty of infant salvation. Indeed we have never felt any argument in favor of the salvation of infants to be so forcible as the one derived from the fact, that by divine command they are buried with Christ by Baptism into His death, (Rom. 6: 4) and thus become sharers in the infinite grace of the Gospel.

We are pleased to see with what distinctness the author does not hesitate to state what he regards as "the benefits which are secured by the blessing of God upon Infant Baptism to the parties concerned." We have not room for a full quotation. The second benefit is the official removal, from the child properly baptized, of the stain or pollution of native depravity. The third benefit is the present renewal of the nature of the child, in Christ Jesus, by the Holy Ghost. The last direct benefit which he spe-

cifies is, that God graciously makes such children *the object of His special care, and mercifully promises to bestow upon them such spiritual blessings as will promote the growth of the grace granted them at their baptism.* This is very different from the usual style in which modern writers allow that the Holy Ghost makes some good impressions, and exercises some indirect spiritual influences upon the heart through the medium of divine ordinances.

The Treatise throughout is written in an easy, simple, direct and lucid style. It breathes that spirit of tender affection for infant children which only a Christian father can feel who has sympathized with the sufferings of his own little child in sickness, and wept at its open grave. Hence the discussion may be characterized as beautiful and deeply interesting. The reader is carried along with pleasure from beginning to end.

The work is designed for circulation among the people generally; and we commend it to their earnest attention.

E. V. G.

HIMMLISCHER WEIHRÄUCHSCHATZ oder Vollständiges Gebetbuch auf allerlei Zeiten, Anliegen und Personen anwendbar; mit einem Unterricht vom Gebrauch des Heiligen Abendmahls, Besuchung der Kranken und dazu passende Gebete. Von Johannes Zollikoffer, D. D., von Herisau, Europa.—Vielfältig vermehrt und zum Druck befoerdert von A. L. Horman, V. D. M.—Nebst einem starken Anhang Communions-Gebete oder Andachts-Uebungen für fromme und nachdenkende Christen, mit Versen versehen. Neunte Auflage.—Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co. 1859. pp. 688.

John Zollikoffer was a learned, devout and eminent divine, of the Reformed Church, who lived during the latter half of the seventeenth century; and is known by his evangelical sermons, but especially by his *Himmlischer Weihrauchschatz*, a volume of Prayers and Meditations, the ninth American edition of which, edited and enlarged by Rev. Augustus L Herman, has just left the press. These prayers spring from the faith, and are pervaded by the humble, earnest and heavenly spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism. Adapted to daily morning and evening worship, to preparation for and observance of the Holy Communion, to seasons of sickness and misfortune, of health and prosperity, to youth, middle life, and old age, and to the numerous and various occasions of life on which the pious heart would turn to our Father in Heaven through our Lord Jesus Christ in humble confession and earnest supplication, this work has deservedly for a century and a half held the place of a classic among books of devotion in the Reformed Church. The continued circulation of it among the people, can not but pro-

mote sound views in religion, and prove, under the blessing of God, a valuable aid to devotion.

The book, as to paper, letter press, binding, etc., is gotten up in Lippencott's best style; not inferior, indeed, to the handsomest publications in the English language.

E. V. G.

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT: A Special Discourse, delivered Feb: 6th, 1859, by Rev. D. Gans, Pastor of the German Reformed church, Harrisburg, Pa. Harrisburg: "Telegraph" Steam Job Printing Office. 1859. 32 pp.

The main purpose of the Discourse is the development of the two-fold antithesis of the text: *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal* (Matt. 25: 46). First, the antithesis of *everlasting* (*unus*) *punishment* to *life eternal* (*eternus*), the same term, expressing duration, being used in the original in both members of the passage; though in the first translated *everlasting*, and in the second *eternal*; from which the author argues forcibly that as future *life* is without end, so will future *punishment* be without end. Secondly, the antithesis of *these*—referring to the “*goats*” (v. 38) or to those “on the left hand” (v. 41)—to the *righteous*; righteousness, or Christ in the man by faith, being the sufficient ground of endless life; and the wickedness of “*these*,” who are “on the left hand” being the sufficient ground of endless punishment. There is no arbitrary decree; but the opposite characters of the two classes lead necessarily to opposite results equally enduring. The presence of Christ, in the one case, is the presence of everlasting life; the absence of Christ, in the other, is the absence of everlasting life. Or, sin, aggravated by unbelief, and eternal death, go together; just as deliverance from sin and deliverance from eternal death.

The argument is well sustained; the train of thought scriptural and practical; and the conclusions legitimate.

E. V. G.

A GRAMMAR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT DICTION: intended as an introduction to the critical study of the Greek New Testament. By *George Benedict Winer*. Translated from the sixth enlarged and improved edition of the original, by Edward Masson, M. A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859.

Messrs. Clark, father and son, worthy and excellent gentlemen, members of the Free Church of Scotland, are really indefatigable in transferring the best works of recent German theology on British and American soil, without regard to risk and ex-

pense. They have certainly a good claim to a permanent, honorable place in a future history of Anglo-German theology and literature.

Winer's Grammar of the New Testament idiom has long since been a standard work, and is familiarly quoted as an authority by all the modern critical commentators. It created once an epoch in New Testament Exegesis and put a stop to the arbitrary interpretations of rationalism in its vain efforts to bring the evangelists and apostles down to its shallow system. It is the best *grammatical key to the New Testament*. The translation seems to be carefully-executed, but embraces so far only about one half of the original.

P. S.

ZWINGLI, or the Rise of the Reformation in Switzerland. A life of the Reformer, by R. Christoffel, Pastor of the Reformed church, Wintersingen, Switzerland. Translated from the German by John Cochran, Esq. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1858. Philadelphia: Smith and English.

A few years ago several Reformed divines of Germany and Switzerland, Dr. Hagenbach of Basel, Drs. Baum and Schmidt of Straasburg, Rev. Messrs. Christoffel of Wintersinger, Pestalozzi of Zurich, Sudhoff of Frankfort, and Stähelin of Rheinfelden, associated for a timely and important literary enterprise, viz: the publication of the lives and labors of the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church on the Continent of Europe, accompanied with large extracts from their principal writings. So far the lives of Zwingli, Peter Martyr, Olevianus and Ursinus have appeared in three distinct volumes by three authors, Christoffel, Schmidt, and Sudhoff, from the press of Friderichs in Elberfeld.

We are glad to see that the first volume has been translated, and that the other volumes will probably follow in due time. We have now two good biographies of Zwingli in the English language, Hottinger's smaller work, ably and faithfully translated by Prof. Porter, and this new work of my friend and early schoolmate, Christoffel, who has succeeded in giving a very animated photographic delineation of the Swiss reformer. To this must be added the spirited and graphic sketch in the first volume of Mr. Harbaugh's somewhat similar work on the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church. (Dr. Mayer's work is not complete even as a history of Zwingli.)

The English translation of Christoffel, as is usual with Clark's publications, surpasses the original in beauty of typographical dress. But we regret that the extracts from his writings, or the entire second part of the original, occupying 350 pages, are

left out entirely. Perhaps it is intended to bring them out in a separate volume. But the translator, Mr. Cochran, gives no intimation to that effect in the preface and is entirely silent on the omission.

P. S.

THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS: An Evidence of Christianity. By Dr. C. Ullmann. Translated from the sixth German edition by R. C. Lundin Brown. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859.

Of the nature and object of this excellent apologetic work of Ullmann, we have spoken at length in a sketch on this divine in the book on Germany, its Universities and Divines. We are glad to welcome it in so worthy and attractive an English dress.

P. S.

THE PROTESTANT THEOLOGICAL AND ECCLESIASTICAL ENCYCLOPEDIA: Being a condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, with additions from other sources, by Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., assisted by Distinguished Theologians of various denominations. Part VIII. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston.

The appearance of Part VIII of this great theological work gives renewed assurance, that, with the zeal and diligence of the Editor and his associates, it is making rapid progress towards its final completion. As the work progresses, it becomes more and more evident, that it will take its place among the greatest productions of the age. This much might indeed be expected from a glance at the array of talent enlisted in the enterprise. Yet no one who has not carefully examined the numbers would expect as much interest as they really possess. The conception that many have of an Encyclopedia, is that it is a sort of dictionary of names, dates, statistics, &c., a book of reference, but not a work which one can sit down leisurely to read. That is doubtless the case with many productions bearing the name *Encyclopedia*, but it is not so with the one here noticed. In this are to be found elaborate articles on the most interesting subjects,—articles as fresh and entertaining as those of a Quarterly Review. Indeed we regard each number of the work as more valuable than a number of a standard Quarterly, and for several reasons. In the first place, there are always to be found in it a number of articles equal in length and of equal ability with those in the very best Reviews. In the second place, the articles possess a permanent value and interest, by reason of the authorities always quoted, and the history and statistics furnished. It is a work to read, and a work for reference also in the future. Then, too, it contains a much larger amount of reading matter in each number than is found

[April,

in the pages of one number of a Quarterly Review. Once more, all this is to be had for the small price of 50 cents, whereas a Review costs generally 75 cents per number. We make these remarks, not to disparage, in any way, the quarterlies. We regard many of them as worth far more than the subscription price. But this comparison is instituted to bring home to the reader the superior excellence of the Encyclopedia.

The present number extends from *Dogmatics* to *Ezra*. (Not to *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (!) as the editor of a western religious periodical stated.) Among its many interesting articles may be found the following: *Synod of Dort*; *The Ebionites*; a paper on *John Eck*, the famous Romanist debater and opponent of Luther; also one on *Jonathan Edwards*; *Ancient and Modern Egypt*; a fine article on the *English Reformation*; biographical sketch of *Erasmus*; an interesting and instructive article on *Eschatology*; and one on *Eutychianism*.

Imperfections, which pertain to all human productions, might doubtless be pointed out in this work. It would be almost a miracle if all the authorities quoted were in every instance found to be entirely correct. Some articles are wanting, which will doubtless appear under another name. We have read some articles which appeared to us inferior to others, and the theological position of which we could not endorse. But we doubt very much whether any other work in the German or English language in this age, can furnish as faithful and correct an exhibition of the position of genuine Protestant theological science and literature at the present time, as the Encyclopedia here noticed. The translation well sustains the good reputation it has already acquired. The Editor and his associates deserve all praise for their labors in bringing out, in a good English dress, so valuable and standard a work. We hope they may feel encouraged to go forward with the enterprise, and that its circulation may be commensurate with its decided merits.

ANON.

ERRATA IN THE JANUARY NUMBER, 1850.

Page 142, 10th line from above, *Amphasen*, read *Ampfingen*.

" " 24th " " east, read west.

" " 28th " " seigniories, read seignories.

" 143 8th " " Bipontani, read Bipontini.

" 144 8th " " Trives, read Trifels.

" 144 18th " " twenty thousand, read two thousand.

" 146 14th " " Margraf, read Markgraf.

" 146 18th " " Achen, read Aachen.